



AGENDA

President and Board of Trustees
Village of Arlington Heights
Board Room

Arlington Heights Village Hall
33 S. Arlington Heights Road
Arlington Heights, IL 60005

May 13, 2019

7:00 PM

I. CALL TO ORDER

II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

III. ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. Village Board 05/06/2019

V. APPROVAL OF ACCOUNTS PAYABLE

VI. RECOGNITIONS AND PRESENTATIONS

VII. PUBLIC HEARINGS

VIII. CITIZENS TO BE HEARD

Anyone wishing to speak on a subject not on the Agenda should fill out a card, located in the back of the room, and hand it to the Village Clerk. Please limit your comments to three minutes.

IX. OLD BUSINESS

X. CONSENT AGENDA

This Agenda consists of proposals and recommendations that, in the opinion of the Village Manager, will be acceptable to all members of the Board of Trustees. The purpose of this Agenda is to save time by taking only one roll call vote instead of separate votes on each item.

Consideration of this Consent Agenda will be governed by the following rules and procedures prior to roll call vote:

1. Any Trustee who wishes to vote "no" or "pass" on any Consent Agenda

- items should so indicate.
2. Upon the request of any one Trustee, any item will be removed from the Consent Agenda and considered separately after adoption of the Consent Agenda.
 3. Citizens in the audience may ask to remove any item on this Consent Agenda.
 4. One roll call vote will be taken and will cover all remaining Consent Agenda items.

XI. APPROVAL OF BIDS

XII. NEW BUSINESS

- A. Election of President Pro Tem
- B. Arlington 425 - Highland/Campbell/Chestnut - PC#19-001
Planned Unit Development, Preliminary Plat of Subdivision,
Rezoning from R-3 to B-5, Land Use Variation to allow a Multi-
Family use within B-5 District, Variations

XIII. LEGAL

XIV. REPORT OF THE VILLAGE MANAGER

XV. APPOINTMENTS

XVI. PETITIONS AND COMMUNICATIONS

XVII. ADJOURNMENT

Persons with disabilities requiring auxiliary aids or services, such as an American Sign Language interpreter or written materials in accessible formats, should contact David Robb, Disability Services Coordinator, at 33 S. Arlington Heights Road, Arlington Heights, Illinois 60005, (847)368-5793 (Voice), (847)368-5980 (Fax) or drobb@vah.com.



**Village Board
5/13/2019**

Item: Village Board 05/06/2019

Department: Village Clerk

ATTACHMENTS:

Description	Type
Village Board 05/06/2019	Minutes



MINUTES

President and Board of Trustees
Village of Arlington Heights
Board Room

Arlington Heights Village Hall
33 S. Arlington Heights Road
Arlington Heights, IL 60005

May 6, 2019

8:00 PM

I. CALL TO ORDER

- A. Oath of Office administered to Trustees LaBedz, Scaletta and Trustees-elect Mary Beth Canty and Tom Schwingbeck by Village President Thomas Hayes

President Hayes administered the Oath of Office to John Scaletta, Robin LaBedz, Mary Beth Canty and Tom Schwingbeck.

II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

III. ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS

President Hayes and the following Trustees responded to roll: Padovani, Schwingbeck, Tinaglia, Baldino, LaBedz, Scaletta and Canty.

Trustee Rosenberg was absent.

Also present were: Randy Recklaus, Robin Ward, Scott Shirley, Mike Pagones, Bill Enright and Becky Hume.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- A. Village Board 04/15/2019

Approved

Trustee Robin LaBedz moved to approve. Trustee Jim Tinaglia Seconded the Motion.

The Motion: Passed

Ayes: Baldino, Hayes, LaBedz, Padovani, Scaletta, Tinaglia

Abstain: Canty, Schwingbeck

Absent: Rosenberg

V. APPROVAL OF ACCOUNTS PAYABLE

A. Warrant Register 04/30/2019

Approved

Trustee John Scaletta moved to approve. Trustee Jim Tinaglia Seconded the Motion.

The Motion: Passed

Ayes: Baldino, Canty, Hayes, LaBedz, Padovani, Scaletta, Tinaglia

Abstain: Schwingbeck

Absent: Rosenberg

VI. RECOGNITIONS AND PRESENTATIONS

Trustee Padovani enumerated the events surrounding the Memorial Day Parade which celebrates its 100th anniversary. There will be a ceremony after the parade honoring our fallen heroes at Memorial Park. A video and Challenge Coin have been created honoring the occasion. Former Trustee Mike Sidor spearheaded the design and manufacture of the coins. Many local people/businesses donated money so that veterans, fallen hero families, local veteran organizations and those that have supported the parade in the Village will receive a coin.

President Hayes read a proclamation for Apraxia Awareness Day on May 14, 2019. He encouraged people to learn about the disorder and raise awareness.

VII. PUBLIC HEARINGS

VIII. CITIZENS TO BE HEARD

Resident Greg Andejaske said the Sons of the American Legion are sponsoring a collection of household goods for homeless veterans this week at the Legion Post on Miner Street.

Resident Robert Schmidt said he was concerned that the people coming off the train are not honoring the traffic signals. He asked if the Police could help. He said he cleans up a lot of trash around town and noted there seems to be a lot of dog waste on the ground. He wondered if the Police could enforce the dog waste provisions in the Code. Mr. Schmidt said there is trash up and down the tracks and asked if Metra be encouraged to clean it up? President Hayes said he appreciated the reminders. Mr. Recklaus said that they will pass the message on to Metra.

IX. OLD BUSINESS

A. Report of Committee-of-the-Whole Meeting of
May 6, 2019

Approved

Consideration of request from Hey Nonny to use a portion of the public sidewalk for outdoor dining, including the serving of alcohol.

Trustee Richard Baldino moved to approve. Trustee Jim Tinaglia Seconded the Motion.

The Motion: Passed

Ayes: Baldino, Hayes, LaBedz, Padovani, Scaletta, Tinaglia

Abstain: Canty, Schwingbeck

Absent: Rosenberg

- B. A Resolution Approving a License Agreement with Harmony Hospitality LLC (Outdoor eating area, Hey Nonny, 10 S Vail Ave) Approved

Trustee Richard Baldino moved to move item XIII Legal to this point in the meeting. Trustee Robin LaBedz Seconded the Motion.

The Motion: Passed

Ayes: Baldino, Canty, Hayes, LaBedz, Padovani, Scaletta, Schwingbeck, Tinaglia

Absent: Rosenberg

Trustee John Scaletta moved to approve R19-017/A19-028. Trustee Jim Tinaglia Seconded the Motion.

The Motion: Passed

Ayes: Baldino, Canty, Hayes, LaBedz, Padovani, Scaletta, Schwingbeck, Tinaglia

Absent: Rosenberg

X. CONSENT AGENDA

CONSENT OLD BUSINESS

CONSENT APPROVAL OF BIDS

- A. Manhole Rehabilitation Approved

Trustee Robin LaBedz moved to approve. Trustee Greg Padovani Seconded the Motion.

The Motion: Passed

Ayes: Baldino, Canty, Hayes, LaBedz, Padovani, Scaletta, Schwingbeck, Tinaglia

Absent: Rosenberg

B. Asphalt Spray Patching 2019 Approved

Trustee Robin LaBedz moved to approve. Trustee Greg Padovani Seconded the Motion.

The Motion: Passed

Ayes: Baldino, Canty, Hayes, LaBedz, Padovani, Scaletta, Schwingbeck, Tinaglia

Absent: Rosenberg

C. Construction Engineering Services - Thomas Tank Painting Approved

Trustee Robin LaBedz moved to approve. Trustee Greg Padovani Seconded the Motion.

The Motion: Passed

Ayes: Baldino, Canty, Hayes, LaBedz, Padovani, Scaletta, Schwingbeck, Tinaglia

Absent: Rosenberg

D. Police Department Vehicles Purchase 2019 Approved

Trustee Robin LaBedz moved to approve. Trustee Greg Padovani Seconded the Motion.

The Motion: Passed

Ayes: Baldino, Canty, Hayes, LaBedz, Padovani, Scaletta, Schwingbeck, Tinaglia

Absent: Rosenberg

E. Downtown Sewer Project - Construction Management Services Approved

Trustee Robin LaBedz moved to approve. Trustee Greg Padovani Seconded the Motion.

The Motion: Passed

Ayes: Baldino, Canty, Hayes, LaBedz, Padovani, Scaletta, Schwingbeck, Tinaglia

Absent: Rosenberg

F. 2019 Resurfacing Program & Sidewalk Program Approved

Trustee Robin LaBedz moved to approve. Trustee Greg Padovani Seconded the Motion.

The Motion: Passed

Ayes: Baldino, Canty, Hayes, LaBedz, Padovani, Scaletta, Schwingbeck, Tinaglia

Absent: Rosenberg

CONSENT LEGAL

- A. A Resolution Accepting a Public Storm Sewer Approved
 Easement
 (107 N Pine Ave)

Trustee Robin LaBedz moved to approve R19-018. Trustee Greg Padovani Seconded the Motion.

The Motion: Passed

Ayes: Baldino, Canty, Hayes, LaBedz, Padovani, Scaletta, Schwingbeck, Tinaglia

Absent: Rosenberg

- B. An Ordinance Designating Two-Way Stop Approved
 Streets
 (George to stop for Mitchell; Marion to stop for
 Hickory)

Trustee Robin LaBedz moved to approve 19-016. Trustee Greg Padovani Seconded the Motion.

The Motion: Passed

Ayes: Baldino, Canty, Hayes, LaBedz, Padovani, Scaletta, Schwingbeck, Tinaglia

Absent: Rosenberg

- C. A Resolution Accepting Required Public Approved
 Improvements
 (Lexington Towne at Arlington Heights
 Resubdivision)

Trustee Robin LaBedz moved to approve R19-019. Trustee Greg Padovani Seconded the Motion.

The Motion: Passed

Ayes: Baldino, Canty, Hayes, LaBedz, Padovani, Scaletta, Schwingbeck, Tinaglia

Absent: Rosenberg

CONSENT REPORT OF THE VILLAGE MANAGER

A. CDBG Budget Transfer Approved

Trustee Robin LaBedz moved to approve. Trustee Greg Padovani Seconded the Motion.

The Motion: Passed

Ayes: Baldino, Canty, Hayes, LaBedz, Padovani, Scaletta, Schwingbeck, Tinaglia

Absent: Rosenberg

CONSENT APPOINTMENTS

A. Boards & Commissions Reappointments Approved

Trustee Robin LaBedz moved to approve. Trustee Greg Padovani Seconded the Motion.

The Motion: Passed

Absent: Rosenberg

XI. APPROVAL OF BIDS

XII. NEW BUSINESS

A. Yamada America - 955 E. Algonquin Rd. - Approved
PC#19-002
Amendment to Rezoning Ordinance 81-112, 82-146, 89-027, and 92-011, Variations

Kevin Sherman, architect for Yamada America, said the business is growing, so they need to expand their warehouse space. They would like to move their offices into an addition over the parking lot and expand the warehouse into where the office space is now. The proposal has unanimous support from the Design and Plan Commissions.

A concern was raised at the Plan Commission Hearing that truck traffic occasionally stacks onto the street blocking traffic. The Police Department and Engineering Divisions were not aware of any issues. Trucks can easily leave the property, but sometimes when backing up, trucks temporarily halt traffic and if the loading docks are full, trucks sometimes wait on the street for access to the site. If these issues becomes more of a nuisance, meaning

complaints are regularly received, there are conditions to the proposal to accommodate the loading and stacking issues. The petitioner has agreed to the conditions. It was recommended that Yamada try to control deliveries as much as possible to avoid the conditions.

Trustee Greg Padovani moved to approve an amendment to Ordinance 81-112 and 92-011 to amend an approved development plan to allow a second floor building as per the Plan Commission's recommendations and the following modifications: 1. The curb cut along Cedar Glen Drive shall be widened as depicted in the Semi Truck Turning Exhibit dated 4-16-19 prepared by Manhard Consulting. 2. If requested by the Village, the property owner shall make the necessary site improvements to allow semi-trailer trucks to enter the site from Algonquin Road and traverse around the west and southern sides of the building to access the loading docks, as generally depicted in the document titled Alternate Truck Entrance Site Improvements as prepared Manhard Consulting. 3. Compliance with the February 26, 2019 Design Commission motion. 4. Compliance with all Federal, State, and Village Codes, Regulations and Policies. Trustee John Scaletta Seconded the Motion.

The Motion: Passed

Ayes: Baldino, Canty, Hayes, LaBedz, Padovani, Scaletta, Schwingbeck, Tinaglia

Absent: Rosenberg

XIII. LEGAL

XIV. REPORT OF THE VILLAGE MANAGER

Mr. Recklaus said the Housing Commission met this evening and made a recommendation on the Arlington 425 Project. The project will be voted upon at a Special Village Board meeting on Monday, May 13th.

XV. APPOINTMENTS

XVI. PETITIONS AND COMMUNICATIONS

XVII. ADJOURNMENT

Trustee Richard Baldino moved to adjourn at 8:58 p.m. Trustee John Scaletta Seconded the Motion.

The Motion: Passed

Ayes: Baldino, Canty, Hayes, LaBedz, Padovani, Scaletta, Schwingbeck, Tinaglia

Absent: Rosenberg



**Village Board
5/13/2019**

Item: Election of President Pro Tem

Department: Village President

Village Code requires that the appointment of a President Pro Tem be made the second Monday in May following a municipal election. The Code further requires the Village President to send a memorandum advising the Village Board of his/her recommendation the Friday before that meeting.

My recommendation is that Trustee Bert Rosenberg be appointed as President Pro Tem and I ask for your concurrence with this recommendation. Bert is our "senior" Trustee having been appointed to the Village Board by Mayor Mulder in 2000 after serving on the Environmental Control Commission for 13 years. He was subsequently elected as Village Trustee in 2001 and has continued to represent the Village of Arlington Heights in a professional and responsible manner for nearly 20 years. Bert's historical perspective, financial expertise, and reputation within the community will serve us well in this role.

Consistent with our team approach, the continued assistance of the entire Village Board in representing me and the Village of Arlington Heights at various functions and in the public arena generally in the same manner is acknowledged and will be greatly appreciated.

Recommendation

It is recommended that the Village Board concur with the appointment of Bert Rosenberg as President Pro Tem.



**Village Board
5/13/2019**

Item: Arlington 425 - Highland/Campbell/Chestnut - PC#19-001

Department: Planning & Community Development

Requested Action:

1. Rezoning from R-3, One-Family Dwelling District to B-5, Downtown District for four lots of the subject property.
2. Planned Unit Development approval to allow a 361-unit mixed-use residential development.
3. Preliminary Plat of Subdivision approval to consolidate the 17 existing platted lots on the subject property into one lot.
4. Land Use Variation to allow residential uses as a principal use in the B-5 District for the proposed building along Chestnut Avenue.

Variations Required:

1. Variation to Chapter 28, Section 5.1-14.4b, Conditions of Use, to allow dwelling units below the second floor within the Chestnut building.
2. Variation to Chapter 28, Section 5.1-14.2a, Required Minimum Yards, to allow a 7' setback along a public street frontage (Chestnut Avenue) for the Campbell building where code requires a 20' setback.
3. Variation to Chapter 28, Section 5.1-14.2a, Required Minimum Yards, to allow a 12.2' setback along a public street frontage (Chestnut Avenue) for the Chestnut building where code requires a 20' setback.
4. Variation to Chapter 28, Section 5.1-14.2b, Required Minimum Yards, to allow a 12.9' setback along an interior lot line (southern lot line) for the Highland building where code requires a 25' setback.
5. Variation to Chapter 28, Section 10.2-7, Size, to allow certain parking spaces within the Highland building garage to be 15.3' in length where code requires 18' in length.

6. Variation to Chapter 28, Section 6.15-2.2, Landscape Requirements between Zoning Districts, to waive the requirement for a 6-foot tall solid screen along the southern property line.

7. Variation to Chapter 29, Section 29-304(I), to allow a 50' wide right-of-way for a local street where code requires a 66' wide right-of-way for local streets, along certain portions of Highland Avenue.

Recommendation:

A public hearing was held by the Plan Commission on April 10, 2019 where Commissioner Cherwin moved and Commissioner Dawson seconded:

A motion to recommend to the Village Board of Trustees approval of PC#19-001, a rezoning from R-3, One-family Dwelling District to B-5, Downtown District, for four lots of the subject property, Planned Unit Development approval to allow a 361-unit mixed-use residential development, Preliminary Plat of Subdivision approval to consolidate the 17 existing platted lots on the subject property into one lot, Land Use Variation to allow residential uses as a principal use in the B-5 district for the proposed building along Chestnut Avenue and the following variations:

1. Variation to Chapter 28, Section 5.1-14.4b, Conditions of Use, to allow dwelling units below the second floor within the Chestnut building.
2. Variation to Chapter 28, Section 5.1-14.2a, Required Minimum Yards, to allow a 7' setback along a public street frontage (Chestnut Avenue) for the Campbell building where code requires a 20' setback.
3. Variation to Chapter 28, Section 5.1-14.2a, Required Minimum Yards, to allow a 12.2' setback along a public street frontage (Chestnut Avenue) for the Chestnut building where code requires a 20' setback.
4. Variation to Chapter 28, Section 5.1-14.2b, Required Minimum Yards, to allow a 12.9' setback along an interior lot line (southern lot line) for the Highland building where code requires a 25' setback.
5. Variation to Chapter 28, Section 10.2-7, Size, to allow certain parking spaces within the Highland building garage to be 15.3' in length where code requires 18' in length.
6. Variation to Chapter 28, Section 6.15-2.2, Landscape Requirements between Zoning Districts, to waive the requirement for a 6-foot tall solid screen along the southern property line.
7. Variation to Chapter 29, Section 29-304(I), to allow a 50' wide right-of-way for a local street where code requires a 66' wide right-of-way for local streets, along certain portions of Highland Avenue.

This approval shall be subject to the following conditions:

Fire/Safety Conditions:

1. The petitioner shall modify the interior access drives as necessary to comply with all fire lane concerns as outlined by the Building Department Fire Safety Division and the Fire Department. Details shall be provided on all pavers to assure the Village that the pavers will support fire apparatus load and the point load of any fire apparatus outriggers.
2. No structure shall be erected and no obstruction shall be placed in the 26' fire lane that runs between the Chestnut building and Highland Building, unless approved by the Fire Department.

Building Conditions:

3. If a restaurant is constructed on the 13th floor of the Highland Building, it shall provide a full kitchen with black iron equipment.
4. The petitioner shall enter into an indemnification agreement with the Village should any balcony or portion of the building encroach into the public right of way.
5. All building mounted and site mechanical equipment (meters, panels, utility connections, fire department connections, transformers, utility pedestals, etc.) shall be appropriately sited and screened from public view, which shall be at the discretion of the Village. To the best extent possible, these elements shall be internalized within structures.
6. The proposed development shall not damage or threaten the structural integrity of the Vail Avenue garage. Prior to building permit issuance, the petitioner shall provide a structural analysis and soil borings that addresses potential impacts to the Vail Avenue garage. The Village reserves the right to review any proposed modifications to the Vail Avenue garage and the ability to require certain upgrades to the garage as it determined necessary to facilitate the proposed development. The costs of any required modifications to the Vail Avenue garage shall be borne by the developer, and any required insurance, bonds, and deposits shall be the developers responsibility. The Village reserves the right to reject any plans or construction that may negatively impact the Vail Avenue garage.

Site Conditions:

7. All utility service lines must be underground. Prior to Final Plat of Subdivision approval, the petitioner shall provide a plan for any overhead utilities that need to be modified to accommodate for the proposed development.
8. The petitioner shall provide final details on the Chestnut building garage ramp

wall (materials, height, etc.) prior to Final Plat of Subdivision approval, for review and approval by the Village.

9. Prior to Final Plat of Subdivision approval, the petitioner shall provide details on all site fencing, including the height, style, and materials of all fences proposed on the subject property. Final fence details shall be subject to review and approval by the Village. Additionally, the loading space screen walls shall be revised to be a solid masonry material to match the buildings. Where applicable, The fence along the southern property line shall be a decorative black metal style open fence.

10. The petitioner shall explore options to minimize or eliminate the retaining wall along the southern property line, and if it is determined that a retaining wall is necessary, in no case shall this retaining wall exceed 3 feet in height. Additionally, said wall shall be setback from the southern property line no less than one-foot to allow for maintenance.

11. The petitioner shall explore further enhancements to the northeast corner of the site to provide a focal point for this prominent corner.

Parking/Loading Conditions:

12. The Highland parking garage parking space allocation and management shall comply with the plan prepared by Briarwood Management LLC, dated April 9, 2019, and shall be subject to the following additional conditions:

a. The subject property shall provide 160 parking spaces in perpetuity for the non-residential uses on the subject property, comprised of 134 non-residential only spaces and 26 non-residential/resident guest parking spaces. These spaces shall be located on the lower level, ground level, level 1.5, and level 2.

I. These spaces shall not be individually assigned to specific non-residential tenants/individuals/employees and shall be open to any non-residential user/customer/employee.

II. Leases for non-residential tenants shall specify that parking is provided within the Highland building garage and that all employees shall park within the Highland building garage.

III. Employees parking rates shall not exceed employee parking rates set by the Village for the Vail Avenue garage.

IV. Part-time employees of the non-residential uses on the subject property shall be provided free parking within the Highland building garage, consistent with the free parking provided by the village within the Vail Avenue garage.

V. Customer parking for customers and patrons of the non-residential uses on the subject property shall be free.

VI. Customer parking shall be restricted to a maximum of 4 hours. There shall be no long-term parking within the 160 non-residential parking spaces.

b. The subject property shall provide no more than 347 parking spaces within the Highland building garage for the residents within the Highland, Campbell, and Chestnut buildings.

I. All residential parking within the Highland building shall be rented separately and shall not automatically be included with a residential lease.

c. Valet parking for restaurants on the subject property shall be provided on Thursday through Saturday within the lower level of the Highland building garage.

d. At the request of the Village, the property owner shall provide details and data on the operation and management of the parking within the Highland building garage. If parking issues arise, the property owner shall work with the Village to modify the parking plan to address any such issues, to the satisfaction of the Village. The property owner shall use good faith efforts to implement and enforce said Highland garage parking conditions and restrictions, and shall have the ability to adjust the above referenced conditions so long as the project is in substantial conformance and the development continues to adequately accommodate the developments' parking demand to the satisfaction and approval of the Village.

13. No employee or residential parking permits for parking within the Vail Avenue garage shall be issued to tenants, residents, or guests of the subject property, unless determined acceptable by the Village.

14. Prior to building permit issuance, the property owner shall provide a parking signage plan outlining how shoppers, employees, and residents will be guided to appropriate parking spaces. Signage shall clearly indicate what spaces are available for public customers.

15. Loading Operations for the development shall be restricted to the following:

a. Commercial/Restaurants/Offices: 7:00am – 3:00pm on Monday through Saturday. No loading permitted on Sundays.

b. Residential: 7:00am – 6:00pm on Monday through Saturday.

c. Street deliveries shall be prohibited, with exception to the on-street loading space in front of the Chestnut building.

d. All trash shall be loaded onto trucks within the loading area. No on-street trash collection shall be permitted.

e. All tenants shall be provided with access to the loading and trash areas.

16. Should portions of the property be sold to separate property owners, the property owner shall draft and record provisions for shared parking, shared access, and shared maintenance of common elements and utilities.

Traffic/Street Infrastructure Conditions:

17. Intersection improvements shall be required at the following intersections:

a. Highland/Campbell: This intersection shall be under 3-way stop sign control. The developer shall install high visibility crosswalks across Highland within this intersection. The Village shall relocate the proposed mid-block crosswalk to the eastern leg of this intersection, which shall extend across Campbell.

b. Highland/Sigwalt: This intersection shall be under 4-way stop sign control. The developer shall be responsible for installing high visibility crosswalks within this intersection.

c. The developer shall install bump-outs for the on-street parking spaces along the southern side of Campbell Street between Highland and Chestnut. This may include the relocation of an existing fire hydrant and installation of required streetscape improvements. Additionally, the developer shall be responsible for installing bump outs for the proposed crosswalk at the eastern leg of the Campbell/Highland intersection.

d. Bump-outs for the on-street parking spaces along the western side of Highland Avenue between Campbell Street and the access drive to the subject property.

18. The developer shall be responsible for the expansion of Chestnut Avenue and installation of the parking lane as depicted on the engineering plans, which shall occur as follows:

a. Between Campbell Street and the drive aisle exit of the development as part of phase one.

b. Between the exit drive of the development and the south property line at the earliest of the following:

I. During Phase two of development.

II. Concurrent with the widening of Chestnut from Sigwalt Street to the south property line of the subject property. If phase two has not commenced, the curb bump out may be omitted (but must be constructed when either 18.b.I or 18.b.III have occurred).

III. Within four years of adoption of this ordinance.

19. Eight feet of land shall be dedicated for public right of way along Chestnut Avenue and along a portion of Highland Avenue, as shown on the Preliminary Plat of Subdivision.

20. If it is determined by the Village that there is unsatisfactory circulation and congestion within and through the subject property, the property owner shall modify the driveway access along Highland Avenue so that it can accommodate two-way travel. Prior to making this determination, the Village will consult with the property owner.

21. The petitioner shall provide visible warning beacons on the garage ramp for the Chestnut building, as well as on the Highland building garage entrances/exits, if determined necessary by the Village.

22. The petitioner shall ensure full streetscape compatibility with the rest of the downtown and shall insure that all disturbed public sidewalks shall be restored in conformance to these standards. Furthermore, prior to building permit issuance, a complete site furnishings package shall be required, for review and approval by the Village.

23. The petitioner shall revise the one-way exit to Chestnut Avenue to bump-out the curb so that the exit tapers down to discourage southbound egress along Chestnut.

General Conditions:

24. At time of building permit, the petitioner shall provide a detailed final construction schedule and logistics plan that identifies staging areas, material storage, lane closures, and construction worker parking for review and approval by the Village. Any work taking place within the right of way shall be scheduled to minimize disruption to other businesses and patrons of the downtown vicinity. Construction traffic shall be limited to pre-approved lanes and locations to be determined by the Village. Emergency access shall be maintained at all times during each phase.

25. The developer shall install and maintain a gateway sign at the northwest corner of the site within the public right-of-way as part of the required streetscape improvements within phase one of development. The design of said sign shall be in substantial compliance to the sign details document dated 4/4/19.

26. Conversion of any building to condominium units shall require an amendment to the PUD and determination of sufficient parking for such change shall be provided to the satisfaction of the Village.

27. Impact fees shall be required in accordance with the requirements of Chapter 29 of the Municipal Code.

28. The developer shall provide the required number of affordable units in

perpetuity as per the recommendation from the Village Board.

29. Compliance with March 12th Design Commission motion shall be required.

30. All restaurants shall be required to apply for a Special Use Permit, or shall apply for a special use permit waiver if deemed acceptable by the village.

31. Medical office uses shall only be allowed after review and approval by Village staff of their projected parking impact. if it is determined by staff that parking for medical offices cannot be adequately accommodated on the subject property, medical office uses shall not be allowed.

32. The petitioner shall comply with all Federal, State, and Village Codes, Regulations, and Policies.

Roll Call Vote: Commissioners Drost, Green, Jensen, Lorenzini, Sigalos, Warskow, Cherwin, Dawson, Chair Ennes voted in favor. Motion carried.

ATTACHMENTS:

Description	Type
PC Minutes 4-10-19 DRAFT	Minutes
Staff Memo 4-5-19	Memorandum
PC Staff Report 3-27-19	Board or Commission Report
PC Minutes 3-27-19	Minutes
UPDATED - REVISED Highland Garage Floor Plans 4-10-19	Exhibits
UPDATED - REVISED Parking Allocation & Management Plan 4-10-19	Exhibits
REVISED - Peak Shared Parking Demand Charts	Exhibits
REVISED - Architectural Plans	Exhibits
Renderings	Exhibits
Traffic & Parking Study	Exhibits
REVISED - Engineering Plans	Exhibits
REVISED - Landscape Plans	Exhibits
REVISED - Unit Mix & Parking Breakout	Exhibits
Internal Loading Space Exhibits	Exhibits
Gateway Sign - Conceptual Plan	Exhibits
Housing Commission Minutes 5-6-19 DRAFT	Minutes
Housing Commission Report 5-3-19	Board or Commission Report
Housing Commission Minutes 4-29-19 DRAFT	Minutes
Housing Commission Report 4-25-19	Board or Commission Report
Developer Housing Proposals	Exhibits
VB Minutes 10-1-18 - Early Review	Minutes
DC Minutes 3-12-19	Minutes
DC Minutes 2-12-19	Minutes

DC Minutes 12-11-18	Minutes
DC Staff Report 3-12-19	Board or Commission Report
DC Staff Report 2-12-19	Board or Commission Report
DC Staff Report 12-11-18	Board or Commission Report
Neighborhood Meeting Summary	Exhibits
Aerial	Exhibits
Project Narrative	Exhibits
Justification for Variations	Exhibits
Plat of Survey	Exhibits
Market Study	Exhibits
Architectural Plans	Exhibits
Construction Staging Plan	Exhibits
Engineering Plans	Exhibits
Landscape Plan	Exhibits
Preliminary Plat of Subdivision	Exhibits
Department Comments - Round 3	Exhibits
Department Comments - Round 3 - Petitioner Response	Exhibits
Department Comments - Round 2	Exhibits
Department Comments - Round 2 - Petitioner Response	Exhibits
Department Comments - Round 1	Exhibits
Department Comments - Round 1 - Petitioner Response	Exhibits
PC Timeline Tracker	Exhibits
Protest Petition	Exhibits

PLAN

REPORT OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF A PUBLIC HEARING
BEFORE THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS
PLAN COMMISSION

COMMISSION

RE: YAMADA AMERICA - 955 EAST ALGONQUIN ROAD - PC#19-002

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS had before the Village of
Arlington Heights Plan Commission Meeting taken at the Arlington Heights Village
Hall, 33 South Arlington Heights Road, 3rd Floor Board Room, Arlington Heights,
Illinois on the 10th day of April, 2019 at the hour of 7:30 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

TERRY ENNES, Chairman
LYNN JENSEN
MARYJO WARSKOW
JOE LORENZINI
BRUCE GREEN
GEORGE DROST
SUSAN DAWSON
JOHN SIGALOS
JAY CHERWIN

ALSO PRESENT:

SAM HUBBARD, Development Planner
CHARLES WITHERINGTON-PERKINS, Director
BILL ENRIGHT, Deputy Director

CHAIRMAN ENNES: This meeting of the Arlington Heights Plan Commission is called to order. Would you all please rise and follow us with the Pledge of Allegiance.

(Pledge of Allegiance recited.)

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Thank you. Sam, will you take the roll?

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Cherwin.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Here.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Dawson.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Here.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Drost.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Here.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Green.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Here.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Jensen.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Here.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Lorenzini.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Here.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Sigalos.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Here.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Warskow.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Here.

MR. HUBBARD: Chairman Ennes.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Here.

So, we have minutes from our last hearing. Has everybody gotten those 69 pages and gone over them and can we get a motion to approve them.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: So moved.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: I'll second.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: And all in favor.

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Any opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Did anyone miss the meeting?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay, so the minutes are approved. The minutes from that meeting happen to be a continuance for one of the Petitions we have this evening. We have two Petitions and is there any interest on the part of the Commissioners as to which one we hear first? I suspect with the number of people here that there will be a lot of discussion, and the second Petition, Yamada America, I never know how long these thing will take. I think that this should be over fairly quickly and will there be a motioning to revise the order of the hearings.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, I'll make that motion.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: I'll second.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: All in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay.

COMMISSIONER DROST: And I think Petitioner's children are waiting in the anteroom, so that makes it another compelling reason to move it along.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay, so our first hearing of the evening is PC#19-002.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: And I'm here, just saying.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: I wasn't going to say anything. Hi, Sue. Yamada American, is the Petitioner here? Would you like to come forward? Will there be anybody else with you that will be speaking this evening?

MR. SHERMAN: My civil engineer is here.

MR. POLASIK: Right here.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay, would you both come forward and I would like to swear you in for the hearing.

MR. SHERMAN: Here?

CHAIRMAN ENNES: No, right there. Please raise your hand.
(Witnesses sworn.)

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay, and when you get up to speak, if you would please spell your name and tell us your name, spell your name for the court reporter so we can get that on the record. And please tell us about your project.

MR. SHERMAN: Should I spell my name first?

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Yes.

MR. SHERMAN: Kevin Sherman, K-e-v-i-n, Sherman, S-h-e-r-m-a-n, an architect for Yamada America. Yamada America is a pump manufacturer, a specialty pump manufacturer. They're headquartered in Japan; they've been in the United States for a number of years. They've been a property owner at their current location in Arlington Heights since 2006. And since that time, they've improved the building on the interior and currently would like to expand the building so they can increase the amount of storage area, warehousing within the building. And the plan is to do that by simply displacing the existing office into a new addition and then using the existing office space to be remodeled to be warehouse space.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay, are you an agent of the Petitioner?

MR. SHERMAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: And are you familiar with the conditions that have been placed on your Petition?

MR. SHERMAN: I have, I am.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Four of those. And are those acceptable to the Petitioner?

MR. SHERMAN: Yes, they are.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay. Did you want to continue on with your description?

MR. SHERMAN: Sure, the pumps are not manufactured in Arlington Heights. They're manufactured in Japan and then shipped to Arlington Heights, where they're distributed around the United States. And they have a light manufacturing component that's done locally based on a customer's order. Sometime, you know, these pumps are used in all different industries, and some industries their applications require specialty diaphragm materials that won't react with corrosive fluids, for example, and they interchange and change out these

components based on a customer's order. The, this is a slide of the existing building with the planned expansion to the bottom of the page or what would be on the east side, and it would be an office addition that would be on stilts for all practical purposes over the existing parking lot.

The current office area is to the right side of that plan. And this shows a diagram of that existing office having been converted to warehouse. The plan at the very top of the drawing is of the office addition. It's mostly open office space and several private offices and support areas. The last slide is some renderings of what it would look like. The upper left rendering is, as viewed from the corner of Glen Court and Algonquin Road. And the rendering below that is from Glen Court and looking to their, the parking lot and the loading dock area in the back side of the office building. In the upper right, upper right-hand corner is simply a cutaway with the roof gone, looking at a diagram, if you will, of the interior.

The materials are brick, which match the existing building, glass, and a metal ribbon below the glass which matches the same material, a dark anodized bronze. The parking area underneath is all open. This rendering doesn't represent any of the landscaping that would be in place in the final development of the project. This addition is approximately 8,000 square feet in area. And that's all I have, if you have any questions.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: We'll do that shortly. And the other person that was going to talk? We you here more to support, to answer questions?

MR. POLASIK: More support and to answer questions.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay, so if that's the end of your report, you can have a seat and we'll go to the Staff report. Sam, before we get started with your report, have all notices been issued?

MR. HUBBARD: Yes, they have.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Thank you. If you would please give us your report?

MR. HUBBARD: Certainly. Okay, so the Petitioner is before you this evening because they are proposing a second floor addition to their structure. The property was originally rezoned from residential into the manufacturing district back in 1981. As part of that rezoning, an ordinance was drafted and approved by the Village Board that authorized the development plan from 1981. The proposed addition to the building is different from the development plan that was approved in 1981, therefore the Petitioner has to apply an amendment to the previously granted ordinances to the site to allow for the proposed building addition.

Additionally, there are four variations requested as part of this application. The Petitioner has provided their justification for each variation as per the criteria in the zoning code and Staff concurs that the necessary criteria for each variation has been met. So, Staff is supportive of the amendment to the previous ordinances as well as the variations. There have been a couple actions to-date that have brought the Petitioner before us this evening. Appearance at the Conceptual Plan Review Committee, where there was very little discussion on the matter. The Conceptual Plan Review Committee was generally supportive of this. And the Zoning Commission heard this project on February 26th and recommended approval subject to one minor recommendation.

We've already talked and heard about the site and the site plan and the landscaping is shown here as well. Really, the main issue with this project was to make sure that given the additional floor area, that the parking complied with code. And as you can see in

this chart above, it does. Additionally, as part of this, the Petitioner surveyed the existing usage of the parking lot and found that on their days of survey, peak occupancy of the parking lot was 31 spaces occupied. As you can see above, there will be a total of 50 spaces on the site once the addition has been constructed so we don't anticipate there to be a parking issue associated with this proposal. That being said, the Staff Development Committee recommends approval of this application subject to two conditions. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Thank you, Sam. Is there a motion to approve the Staff report?

COMMISSIONER DROST: I'll make that motion.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Second.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay, all in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Anyone opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay, Commissioners, let's start down with you, Mr. Cherwin, and do you have any questions for the Petitioner?

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: I don't. I reviewed the project in the Committee. It's a great business. I think it's good that they're investing in the community. I have no further questions, thank you.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay, and if we can just move this way.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Yes, I likewise was at the Conceptual Plan Review Committee meeting and have really no further questions. I'm supportive of it and glad to see that their business is expanding and wants to stay here in Arlington Heights, so I'm very supportive.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Thanks, Mr. Sigalos.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: I have no questions.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Awesome, okay.

COMMISSIONER DROST: I just one question of the Petitioner. The increase in space is due to the location and business operations of Yamada. They aren't consolidating from other locations, but this is evidence of some growth in the business.

MR. SHERMAN: Correct, their sales have increased, which requires them to carry greater product or stock of product so they can ship product to the customer.

COMMISSIONER DROST: So, it's not a company consolidation but it is actually somewhat of an --

MR. SHERMAN: Correct, it's growth in sales.

COMMISSIONER DROST: -- organic increase in their business and because Arlington Heights is such an inviting community, correct?

MR. SHERMAN: It is.

COMMISSIONER DROST: We'll get that in for the record.

MR. SHERMAN: Okay.

COMMISSIONER DROST: All right.

MR. SHERMAN: They were very intentional in moving here in 2006 and their intent to stay as well.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Commission Jensen?

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: No, I don't have any questions. I was in Conceptual Review and I think it's a good project and support it.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Commission Warskow?

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: No questions.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: I'm moving right along.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: I have one quick question. So, why was the 10-and-a-half foot drive aisle variance needed?

MR. HUBBARD: Because the drive aisle, what is required would be 12 feet.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: What?

MR. HUBBARD: The drive aisle is required to be 12 feet in width.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Why can't they do it at 12 feet? Do you have a quick plan they could show us?

MR. HUBBARD: Because they have parking on one side and so with the parking row, that reduces the drive aisle to 10-and-a-half feet, so they don't have any room unless they were to actually expand the existing drive aisle.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: All right, thank you.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Mr. Green?

COMMISSIONER GREEN: I have nothing but kudos to say to Kevin, the architect. It's a nice solution to the building, second floor. I like it.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay, thank you. Is anyone in the audience to comment on this petition?

AUDIENCE COMMENTS

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay. Would you please state your name?

MS. FINNEY: I am Amy Finney, A-m-y, F-i-n-n-e-y.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: And you don't have to tell us where you live, but sometimes it's helpful to us.

MS. FINNEY: Oh, I will. I live at the, Yamada's at the end of our subdivision.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay.

MS. FINNEY: My fundamental question is whether you did a traffic study, because when we're trying to get down our streets, the trucks have a difficult time getting in and out of there, on Cedar Glen, when they turn it, they don't have enough room to get into the parking lot. And so I don't know if these plans took that into consideration because now it looks like they're adding building into the part in the front where they're blocking the street and blocking traffic on Algonquin when people are trying to get, and turn down onto our street. And I'm not sure if you guys have thought about that, but it takes them quite a bit to turn around the big semis in that small, it's just a plain old side street and back into where they need and it blocks up traffic on Algonquin and in our subdivision.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay, I will ask the Petitioner. If I could ask you the, the expansion, the addition is office, correct?

MR. SHERMAN: Correct.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: You're not increasing the size of your plant, your

warehouse?

MR. SHERMAN: No.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Will there, do you expect there will be more truck traffic on the property?

MR. SHERMAN: I don't think they anticipate more truck traffic, but more, larger trucks, semis, instead of small trucks.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay, when you did your architectural plan, Sam, if I can ask you this, did we do a site survey? Did the roads appear adequate to handle truck traffic for the size of the vehicles that are there?

MR. HUBBARD: Because they're not changing the access at all to the site, we didn't require a traffic study as part of this, so --

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay.

MR. HUBBARD: -- you know, the site still has the loading docks that exist today, that are functional today. And, no, there was no traffic study because there was no change to what's already there. There's no change to the access aisles.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay, so Mr. Sherman, are you aware of any condition where trucks would have a hard time accessing and entering and leaving the property.

MR. SHERMAN: I'm not aware, and I've been working with Yamada since 2006. If there's ever --

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Would the other gentleman that is here with you, would he know anything about that?

MR. SHERMAN: I don't think --

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Are you an operational person?

MR. POLASIK: No, I'm just a civil engineer.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Oh, just a civil engineer. So modest. Okay.

MR. SHERMAN: I do know that they have six loading positions on site and primarily only the two, the recessed dock, which is the drive-in dock to the building, are used. The others are rarely used.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: So, this isn't a condition that we reviewed? Thank you.

MR. SHERMAN: You're welcome.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: I'm sorry, we really can't answer that question. For, I'm talking to, is there anybody else in the audience that wanted to raise a question. Okay, I'm going to close the public portion of this hearing and I would be open to entertain a motion by the Commission for approval.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: I'd like to make a motion to recommend to the Village Board of trustees.

A motion to recommend to the Village Board of Trustees, approval of P.C. No. 19-002, an amendment to Ordinances 81-112 and 92-011 to amend an approved development plan to allow a second-floor building addition and the following variations:

1. Chapter 28, Section 5.1-16, to allow the M-2 District to be 2.49 acres in area where code requires a minimum M-2 Zoning District size of 4 acres.

2. **Chapter 28, Section 10.2-8, to allow a 10.5' wide drive aisle where code requires a minimum of 12' in width for a one-way drive aisle with parallel parking.**
3. **Chapter 28, Section 6.15-1,2(b), to waive the requirement for landscape islands at the end of certain parking rows.**
4. **Chapter 28, Section 6.12-1.2(a), to waive the requirement for a traffic and parking study by a qualified professional engineer.**

Approval shall be subject to the following conditions:

1. **Compliance with the February 26, 2019 motion from the Design Commission.**
2. **The Petitioner shall comply with all Federal, State, and Village codes, regulations, and policies.**

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: I'll second.

MR. HUBBARD: Sam, would you take a roll call?

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Cherwin.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Yes, with comment.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Dawson.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Drost.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Aye.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Jensen.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Lorenzini.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Warskow.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Chairman Ennes.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Green.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Yes..

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Sigalos.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: So, you have a unanimous approval from the Plan Commission. You can, oh, okay. Yes, I know. You have the unanimous approval. We have one comment from one of the Commissioners. Jay?

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: No, I was just going to say if I could ask the Staff, if there are some issues, we don't want to, you know, it's not really maybe the purview of what this approval is given what we're approving, but I think it's worth at least reaching out to the Petitioner, making sure that if there are some changes they can make to how they're loading and


how they're staging. You know, we do our best to try to make things right over there.

MR. HUBBARD: Prior to this going to the Village Board, we'll reach out to the Yamada folks and see what changes we can work in them with them.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Thank you, Jay. Okay, thank you.

(Whereupon, the public hearing on the above-mentioned petition was adjourned at 7:48 p.m.)



PLAN

REPORT OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF A PUBLIC HEARING
BEFORE THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS
PLAN COMMISSION

COMMISSION

RE: ARLINGTON 425 - HIGHLAND/CAMPBELL/CHESTNUT - PC#19-001

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS had before the Village of
Arlington Heights Plan Commission Meeting taken at the Arlington Heights Village
Hall, 33 South Arlington Heights Road, 3rd Floor Board Room, Arlington Heights,
Illinois on the 10th day of April, 2019 at the hour of 7:48 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

TERRY ENNES, Chairman
LYNN JENSEN
MARYJO WARSKOW
JOE LORENZINI
BRUCE GREEN
GEORGE DROST
SUSAN DAWSON
JOHN SIGALOS
JAY CHERWIN

ALSO PRESENT:

SAM HUBBARD, Development Planner
CHARLES WITHERINGTON-PERKINS, Director
BILL ENRIGHT, Deputy Director

CHAIRMAN ENNES: So, we're moving on to our second, the continuance of our second Petition this evening. Petition #19-001, the Arlington 25 property and for those of you who are not aware, there have been, there has been a lot of discussion going on about this development and there are economic conditions or recommended conditions from the Planning Department to the Village that came out late today.

I understand we will put them up on the screen for people to review, and hopefully most of the Commissioners have had access to those earlier today and, if not, they are on your blue sheets. But so if I can call the Petitioner up, as you are well aware, we continued the hearing from two weeks ago and you and Staff have been pretty busy working out a number of the issues that were of concern.

MR. FIRSEL: Indeed.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Both us and the Staff.

MR. FIRSEL: Yes.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: And, Mr. Firsell, if you want to again state your name and spell it for the court reporter, and then tell us where, tell us what these changes are, what's going on with the project. Where are you, obviously these conditions are important. Last time we reviewed them individually, I would be interested in hearing direction from you as to, based on these new conditions, what, which ones you can live with and more importantly, which ones we need to work on this evening if we can.

MR. FIRSEL: Certainly, thank you. My name is Michael Firsell, the attorney for Arlington 425D, developer CCH, LLC. First of all, I want to, it is worth noting that we cannot express our appreciation enough to Staff for the timeless energy and effort they put in, including today, which results in what we believe is going to be a stupendous project. There are very few, if any, recommendations to which we do not agree. There may be a clarification or a, and if you want me to go through them now, but what we were going to do is basically I was going to have Deb Smart, who is the operations manager and consultant, go through what, in fact, we did change from the last meeting and how we believe that that improves the project and also complies with some of the issues that Staff had, which is why it was continued to this evening.

We see no reason why, after your review and consideration, should you choose or elect to approve this project, I think we're ready to go. So, with that, we have four or five slides and then we'll move it along. It is not our intention to repeat last, two weeks ago but simply show the differences of what we have done. The only slide I'm going to specifically talk about at this time is the overall site plan, which has changed only in one significant respect and, oops, I pressed the wrong button, and I don't know, there's the laser, is pointed at the truck docks along Highland, which the Staff was previously suggesting we move inside the site. In light of the fact that we have reduced the number of parking spaces requested from seven down to three, and the fact that we are adding significant additional parking spaces to the Highland garage, our discussions with Staff are that this dock at this location, and due to these factors, would be appropriate.

So, the only thing I did want to point out on that was the fact that we did provide an additional four spaces at this location, so that's really most of what has changed, in fact all that I believe has changed on the overall site plan. With that, I'm going to ask Deb Smart to come up, spend a couple of minutes going over the actual garage layout, how it works, which was of major concern and then we can go through some of the conditions. I did want, and Deb reminded me to do one thing, which I am going to take just one moment to do, which was

not on the record at our last hearing and I do want to put it on the record that there are significant sustainable features and elements to this project, including our attempt to provide lead certification for the project.

And I believe they are self-explanatory. There are 15 of them on here and I didn't want to read through all of them, but I did want to make sure that our proposed sustainable elements for this project are considered and let you know that we are very sensitive to and supportive of as many sustainable features for this project as possible. With that, I'm going to ask Deb to come up and just take you through a couple of exhibits that she will go through with you. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Thank you, Mr. Firsel. Ms. Smart, if I could ask you to state your name again and please spell it for the court reporter.

MS. SMART: Debbie Smart, S-m-a-r-t. I'm a consultant from Briarwood Management. We manage several properties here in Arlington Heights and in the Chicagoland area. Before I start, I want to again also thank Staff for their help. This has been a very intensive couple weeks and they have been instrumental in helping us get to where we are today. And on a lighter note, happy national bookmobile day. Library plug, okay?

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Thanks.

MS. SMART: Before you, you have the plans for the lower level through the fifth floor of our parking structure. In consultation with Staff and our fine team of people here, we have actually increased the parking in this building by 21 spots. We have also gone through and designated spots in floors that are for specific purposes. This is, I will be honest with you, the most comprehensive parking plan I've ever put together in my 10 years working for Briarwood.

So, if we start on the ground level, which is all in the bluish mauve color, all 24 of those spots will be for restaurant and retail use. Easy convenience, in and out, I believe pretty self-explanatory. If you go to the lower left slide, you will see it is a beautiful mix of red and blue. I tried to make it exciting. That is going to be mixed use for our office folks and for restaurant retail. It will be also the floor where we will be housing our valet parking for our restaurant.

If you move up to the second floor, which is the lower right slide, you will see we have additional 44 spots in the purplish blue color for retail. We have 12 spots for residents and we have 12 spots that are designated as mixed use for residents, guests, and restaurant retail if needed. Then the slide in the upper right-hand corner is actually representative of floors three through five and those are all going to be numbered assigned residential spots.

The last slide here actually shows the sixth floor which shows it's completely also dedicated to resident use. If you look at the numbers in recap, we have 347 spots for residents. We have now increased our spots for non-resident use up to 160, which is the highest dedicated spots for non-resident use in the Village. And in conclusion, I think pretty much that covers it. We have gates that are going to control the flow for the resident parking. They will actually have an entrance and exit ramp which takes them immediately up to the resident spot. It will be fobbed controlled. The lower levels will be either fobbed or a, some type of parking pass controlled, which will be given validation from our retail partners and our restaurant.

We have put in our detailed plan which is accompanying your documentation. Our pricing, which is exactly the pricing that is currently going on in the Village

today for guest parking, employee parking, so on and so forth. I think overall, it's very, very comprehensive. We do have the Chestnut building which is on this slide also which will have 58 dedicated parking spots to their residents. And that's all I have.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Thank you.

MR. FIRSEL: Thank you. I would like to clarify one thing for the record. We are adding 21 parking spots overall to the project. We are adding 47 to Highland garage. So, what we have done is we have, we're providing 58 spots for Chestnut for that 54-unit project. Anybody who has two cars, over four people that have two cars will be absolutely accommodated in the Highland garage. There will be an underground connection between the two buildings and, as a result, we have gone from 460 spots in the Highland garage to 507, an increase of 47 spots.

The peak time issue that was brought up at the last meeting said we needed 157 spots when we only were providing 135 for non-residential. We now have 160, so we exceed the peak, that peak time as well. All in all, I think we have worked, and by the way, this was not singular, this was truly a partnership with the Staff at trying to and arriving at these conclusions. And if you have any questions after the Staff's report or the public, we'll be more than happy to respond. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Thank you very much. Can we have the Staff report?

MR. HUBBARD: Absolutely. So, I'll just touch on some of the key changes, go over them again. Some of the major changes to the plans was, as you heard, an increase of 47 spaces within the Highland Building. Previously the Petitioner had 460 spaces, now they're proposing 507 spaces. Additionally, in the Chestnut building, they revised the parking structure there and that revision resulted in a reduction of 26 parking spaces for the Chestnut building. So, previously they had 84 spaces, currently they're proposing 58. This results in a net increase of 21 parking spaces, so the previous total as 544, now they're proposing 565.

Additionally, as you heard, they adjusted the entrances to the building and loading zone along Highland to save additional street parking spaces. Based on these revisions, they were able to save four street parking spaces along Highland that had previously been proposed for removal. I'll go through the levels real quick. This is the lower level. You'll see office and resident, I'm sorry, office and restaurant retail parking will occur on the lower level. On the ground level, there will be retail and restaurant parking.

And on the second level, there will be a combination of restaurant retail parking, restaurant and guest parking, and then will lead up to a small portion of residential parking. All in all, the restaurant, retail and office parking, as well as the resident and guest parking equates to, I believe it is 160 spaces. So, 160 spaces will be dedicated for restaurant, retail, office, and a small portion of resident guest parking. As the garage leads up, it will be restricted to residential parking only and it will provide a total of 347 spaces for residents only and, as I said before, 160 spaces for non-residential uses, a small portion being for residential guest parking as well.

So, what Staff did is we analyzed this parking in relation to what we believe the estimated peak parking demand would be for this site. We wanted to make sure that the spaces that were dedicated for non-residential uses, the green, I'm sorry, the blue and the pinkish red on the previous slides, that there was enough of those spaces to accommodate for the peak non-residential demand.

Here you can see the peak non-residential demand represented on

a weekday. That peak demand was 132 spaces and the Petitioner was proposing that combination of 160 spaces. So, we believe if the residential units are parked at 1.3 spaces per unit, and the commercial per the ITE forecasted demand, that the Petitioner does have enough parking on site to accommodate for the peak weekday demand of the commercial. Again, we looked at the weekend and we found that the peak commercial demand increase a little bit on weekend and that peak demand is estimated at 157 spaces.

Compare that to the 160 spaces that will be allocated for commercial demand, and we believe the new plan addresses the peak commercial demand. That being said, we believe that the parking does work. However, there needs to be adequate restrictions on proper management of that parking in order for it to accommodate for the peak demands, making sure that there are enough spaces dedicated for the non-residential demand known as the commercial, as you can see in the slide. And we believe with the proper conditions of approval, that they can meet the estimated projected demand.

So, the Staff Development Committee has recommended approval of the application subject to conditions 1 through 32. We do have all those conditions spread out through several slides rather than go through each of them individually. I think it would probably be best to focus on the ones where there may be some disagreement on and we're happy to get into detail on those items as they come up. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay, thank you for your report. Can I have a motion to accept the Staff report?

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: I'll make that motion.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: And a second?

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: I'll second.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: All in favor.

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Is anyone opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Mr. Chairman, do we also want to make a motion to submit Mr. Firsel's list of sustainable items as well?

CHAIRMAN ENNES: We should. So, as a condition of our motion, do you want to, Bruce, you made the motion. Joe, do you want to add the addition of the addendum that Mr. Firsel gave us?

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Yes, well I delete items to the minutes, to the meeting.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Second.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay, any other questions?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay, all in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Anybody opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay, we can either address questions or I would like to address with the Commissioners a procedural call and that is when we met last time, we

continued that hearing to address a limited number of issues and at that meeting, we had closed the public portion of the hearing. Do we want to re-open that? Do we want to limit that to the current issues that we are addressing tonight? I'd like to hear your thoughts on that.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: I think we should limit them to the issues that we are going to be addressing tonight. We had a full hearing for several hours two weeks ago.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: I agree.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: I agree.

COMMISSIONER DROST: I agree also.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: I agree.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: I agree.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay, so can I have a motion on that?

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: So moved.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: And a second?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Second.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: All in favor.

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Anyone opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay, maybe I should have asked this first. Does anybody in the audience want to comment on the conditions that we are, the remaining conditions that we are addressing this evening. Anybody want to, anybody, have you been online with the project?

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: A little bit.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: A little bit, okay. Okay, mainly what we're talking about is traffic flow within the building and the level of parking spots that are made. There are also conditions in there on the pricing of parking spots. It's primarily related to the parking within the building, general conditions which are construction things that are basically standard with all developments. Fire safety on how parking, fire trucks can be built and some of the building conditions as relate to their impact on the Vail Street Garage.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Can we ask for just one clarification. The Petitioner said he agrees with the conditions, he might have a comment about one or two. Perhaps he should expand upon that comment before --

CHAIRMAN ENNES: I think we'll go back.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: No, I understand, but the audience is asking what are the conditions. Maybe we should know what the comments are before the audience.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Well, would you like to address the Petitioner before we go to neighbor comments.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: I'd just like to know the comments, the comments or the reservations or, to anything on some of the conditions before we let the audience speak.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Are you open to that?

MR. WITHERINGTON-PERKINS: Chairman, could I just give an overview on the conditions, what's changed, so everybody knows. There were a number of conditions discussed at the last meeting. The majority of the changes pertain to parking, Condition 12 here. Some of these were phrased differently before or some of them weren't addressed, so

that's where the primary focus has been.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: In traffic flow.

MR. WITHERINGTON-PERKINS: There was a condition relative to elimination of the Highland's loading zones based on the new information, we've re-evaluated that and Staff Development Committee has acquiesced on that and so that condition --

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Left it in place.

MR. WITHERINGTON-PERKINS: That condition has gone away.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Right.

MR. WITHERINGTON-PERKINS: The other major area of change on the conditions pertained to the phasing of the widening and improvements on Chestnut Avenue, when that, all of that parking lane gets installed and so there is a revised condition on that. There are some minor tweaks in other areas, just relative to how they were phrased. But the majority of them deal with the parking because the hearing was continued to get the detailed parking plan we got last week. We met earlier this week with the developer and their team, revised it again today and some back and forth on these conditions. So, most of the changes pertain these parking conditions that are up on the slide here.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Item No. 12.

MR. WITHERINGTON-PERKINS: Correct.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Mr. Firsel, would you like to go over where you are on the current Condition No. 12?

MR. FIRSEL: I will. First of all, other than item 12, the Petitioner agrees with all other proposed conditions that were submitted to you. So, there are some, there's a couple ways to approach how we would like to come to hopefully an agreement with Staff on the parking issues. If you look at those conditions, they are very specific, very restrictive. Words like in perpetuity, shall, must, et cetera.

Today, we are not certain as to whether or not the lack of flexibility on a privately owned garage that we have to pay taxes on, maintain, we might have to change the fees. We might have to re-allocate based on usage how many spots there are for residential and how many spots there are for commercial. So, the slide you see before us is a, is the top language is what we have proposed to add to only Condition 12, and that is that the developer shall use good faith efforts to implement and enforce said Highland garage parking conditions and restrictions due to the fact it's private ownership developer shall have the ability to adjust the above-referenced program from time to time based on demand and market conditions.

In going through this with Charles late this afternoon, the Staff came back with the language on the bottom which is attached to one of the conditions, that is so long as we do not or the project does not negatively impact the Vail Garage, subject to the satisfaction and approval of the Village. This being a private garage, it is, is or should eminently clear that we far, far exceed all parking code requirements. We have added 47 spots to this garage, 21 overall, and for us to have to go to the Village every time we want to make a modification in our privately owned garage to accommodate our residents or our customers, it's just too restrictive.

And we need the ability to operate our garage that we own on our private property the best way that we can for our residents and our retailers. In addition, it seems to imply that, the additional language in red seems to imply that this project shouldn't be using any public parking, especially in the Vail Garage. And I don't know where that requirement

comes from, I don't believe it's anywhere else in this Village that anybody is restricted from using public parking. We have done everything that we can possibly do to satisfy the requirements for parking, have far, far exceeded those requirements at a cost of the extra, I think, over code. We are well over 100, and I think we're about 120 spots over code at a cost of somewhere around \$3.5 million.

And to restrict us to not being able to be flexible with how we operate this garage is a, problematic for us. You heard from Deb Smart, who works with this Village and has worked on other projects. We have provided the appropriate safety allocations for this project. We will be having a full-time garage manager on site at all times to regulate what goes on in the garage. So, if we have to re-allocate or relocate, we don't want to have to come every time we do that to the Village for their approval because it might create one or two, three, 10, however many cars parking in public parking spaces outside of this garage.

So, that is the only issue that we have that we would like to hear from the Plan Commission on in resolving this evening and if we could add that very first four lines to the end of the paragraph 12 or Recommendation 12; we would be in full support of all of the conditions.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Jeremy, I would like to hear the Villages' response to that.

MR. WITHERINGTON-PERKINS: Yes, so we tried to add as much flexibility as we could. The concern was, we don't know what changes they may want to make down the road. Some of them may be perfectly fine. If they start impacting the ability for the development's parking demand to park in the garage, then we would have some concerns. You know, wouldn't have an objection to changing the reference to Village garage to the following, to say so long as the development continues to adequately accommodate the development's parking demand to the satisfaction of and approval of the Village.

This is no different than many other developments where they have an approved plan and if somebody wants to make some changes to it, and they're significant, we would review them and if they're in substantial compliance, that would get approved. If they weren't, they may need to amend it. So, it's no different than any other development. For example, Arlington Dance is a series of conditions relative to Arlington Dance and their parking. They can certainly make some changes within various parameters, but at some point, if it's a substantial change, then that may have to trigger review and approval by the Village.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Question Charles, would you first of all read that again, slowly, and then I'd like to ask the Petitioner if that solves part of their problem or all of their problem.

MR. WITHERINGTON-PERKINS: Yes, so towards the end, you know, they've got underlined starting at so long as, so I started from there. Leaving everything else the same, so long as the development continues to adequately accommodate the development's parking demand to the satisfaction and approval of the Village.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: And does the Petitioner, have you discussed it with the Petitioner and do they have a problem with that?

MR. WITHERINGTON-PERKINS: No, we, we got the developer's requested language late this afternoon, so we incorporated it, made a slight change oversee and sent it to the developer so we weren't aware that there was a concern there. So, I just came up with this as they were discussing it this evening.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Maybe we can have the Petitioner respond to that, then. So, you're mainly asking them to make sure that they accommodate whatever their parking needs are.

MR. WITHERINGTON-PERKINS: That's correct, to the satisfactory of the Village, satisfaction of the Village.

MR. FIRSEL: Okay, it is, the language on its face is fine, that Charles is proposing with a, I just need one. We just need a clarification. It says subject to the approval of the, or satisfaction and approval of the Village. What is the standard? Is the standard all of the conditions or is the standard your code, is the standard the ITE parking ratios? We're not sure what it is that the Village is looking to approve.

We don't have a problem satisfying the requirements of this project according to Village code, okay, and it's substantial conformity with the conditions. That's not a problem. We just don't know, I couldn't tell you today if something came up, what would we have to get the Village's approval on and what would we not? If we want to add 10 more spaces to the commercial and take away 10 from the residential because we're only using 200 spots and not 347, do we have to go back to the Village? Do we have to go back to Staff?

We, so on its face, I don't have a problem with the, the complying with the requirements for our project, okay? I have a problem in not knowing when it is we have to go back to the Staff or the Village Board or you and when we don't. So, we're getting there, but it's, that's my dilemma.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, there's a, you know, sort of a hypothetical here where you try to price out some of the retail or some of the use that you've got in your building, just throw it over into, into the Vail Garage. So, I mean, those are the kind of murky things. Let's say you can, the market forces will work and you double or triple your monthly rent or it's way out of, out of consistent with what the Village charges for rentals. And that might be sort of a way where, if you raise your parking prices too high, then the pressure falls on the Vail street deck.

MR. FIRSEL: Well, one of the conditions is that any customer of any retailer, that customer parks for free in our garage. That is a condition that we have agreed to, okay?

MR. WITHERINGTON-PERKINS: An open-ended like this would allow you to change that, so that's, you know, and if you, let's say hypothetically you wanted to increase the residential parking by 100 and decrease the customer and business parking by 100, then the project may not manage its own parking needs. So, you know, I have no problem changing from Vail Garage and focus on the demand in this development, and the standards would be the demand that's being happening in the development at the time that prompted the need as well as typical industry standards.

MR. FIRSEL: And that would be fine if we could, you know, I guess it's the, as long as we're in substantial conformity to this plan, changing 347 spots to 247 spots for residential, of course we, that is far, far from what we're talking about here. One is the fees because, you know, Vail Garage doesn't pay taxes. This garage is, the tax bill for this garage is going to be enormous, okay? So, we do intend to charge our residents to park in this garage, okay?

We are telling our employers, your employees, or so many of your employees will have free parking in our garage. If you have more than X, we're going to have to

charge you. So, we don't want to have to go to the Village to get approval to do that. So, it's a, I think if we could broaden the language to so long as we're in substantial conformity with the conditions, that we would not need the consent. But anything that Village or the Staff determines is, causes a non-conformity with the nature and intent of all these conditions, we would have to go to them to discuss.

Keep in mind that another one of the conditions is a reporting requirement by us as to how things are going in the garage, and we've agreed to that condition. So, it's not that we're going to just be arbitrarily changing things around and charging people a significant amount of money to park in this garage. We would, like I said, substantial conformity with these conditions, we're okay with. But we don't want to be tied down to 160 units in perpetuity is what the condition is. We simply, that's just way too defining and restrictive for us, so that's where we are.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: On that subject, if I can ask Staff, why are we saying in perpetuity? Twenty years from now if we have global warming and some of these politicians come, we're not going to have cars. But, I mean, that is a problem I had in here, that we're going to tell him he's got to have these spots in perpetuity. That's not, and that's going to be ingrained in the ordinance?

MR. WITHERINGTON-PERKINS: That's correct. Keep in mind, this is not a worse-case scenario of, you know, the parking demand. I mean, they've accommodated a lot of parking on this site, don't get me wrong, and we're supportive of the development. We think it will be a fantastic development for downtown, but it's definitely not a worse-case scenario. It could be a higher residential demand, it could be higher commercial demand. This is, you're looking at a model, taking the information from the Petitioner's traffic consultant and allocating in an hour-by-hour basis and then trying to divide it up into different user groups.

Certainly any condition in the ordinance can always be amended. The Village amends ordinances for developments many times. Arlington Dance is also another example where they've amended their ordinance, you know, probably five or six times based upon your market conditions and market needs. This language would allow some administrative, you know, adjustment of that. I don't have a problem adding so long as in substantial compliance and the development continues to adequately accommodate development's parking needs to satisfaction and approval of the Village. I don't have a problem adding that for a little more flexibility.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Is that something that works?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Can you go back to the slide, it --

MR. FIRSEL: Mine?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: The one with the proposed language.

MR. FIRSEL: Yes.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Of yours versus the Village.

MR. FIRSEL: I'm going the wrong way, my apologies. I'll stay on it. There we are.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Okay, so where are we proposing adding substantial compliance here?

MR. WITHERINGTON-PERKINS: Where the red on the line is, it says, starts so long as, you know, I came up with the following, so long as the project remains in substantial compliance and the development continues to adequately accommodate the

development's parking demands to the satisfaction and approval of the Village.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: To your, does it work for you? That language?

MR. FIRSEL: Yeah, yeah.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: In their language, their paragraph, the Village's paragraph, modifying that last sentence works for you?

MR. FIRSEL: So long as, could you please repeat it one more time, Charles?

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Could you just write that down?

MR. WITHERINGTON-PERKINS: Well, I've got it written down, but --

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: So, instead of so long as they don't negatively impact --

MR. WITHERINGTON-PERKINS: Right.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: -- you have a different sentence there?

MR. WITHERINGTON-PERKINS: Right, starting so long as the development or project remains in substantial compliance and continues to adequately accommodate the development's parking demands to the satisfaction and approval of the Village.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: And you're okay with that addition?

MR. FIRSEL: Yes.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Okay.

MR. FIRSEL: It gives us the small amount of flexibility that we're asking for and it also, by being substantially means we can't take 100 parking spots away. We can't triple, you know, the fees, okay? But we'll be in substantial compliance with the conditions that have been imposed. So, perpetuity, I'm not sure the intent was perpetuity, it's so long as the current plan exists and then you've got to have 160. Plans change. I think we can all agree that when this project is built, whatever we decide tonight or whatever you vote on tonight, there is likely to be circumstances at the time that could change it.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: So, what does this propose to revise or amend on the conditions that we have in front of us? Is it --

MR. FIRSEL: That is one of the conditions. Which one is that?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: I know it is, but it doesn't match.

MR. WITHERINGTON-PERKINS: It's the end of 12D, the last two sentences of 12D.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Okay, so we still have 12A, which says the property shall provide 106 parking spaces.

MR. WITHERINGTON-PERKINS: Correct.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Okay, I'm just clarifying and making sure because you're objecting to the 160 parking spaces, but this language in D is still --

MR. WITHERINGTON-PERKINS: I think what we're trying to do is, I don't want to answer for Mr. Firsell, but I'm not sure he's objecting to the 160, because that's what we talked about yesterday. But trying to build some flexibility, because people's habits and patterns change and technology changes and so that's why we had a condition to allow a review and then they wanted a condition to be added to be able to, you know, modify as well. And so we're trying to find, you know, language that will work for everybody. Is that a fair assessment?

MR. FIRSEL: Okay, is there a way to make this bigger? Because what I did is I didn't put it as part of 12D, okay? I put it at the end of 12 as a catchall, not as part of 12D. So, it would apply to the entire --

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: You took out the in perpetuity.

MR. FIRSEL: We're okay with leaving the Village's conditions as they were. All I'm talking about is, is, so sorry --

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: 12A you've changed.

MR. FIRSEL: All I'm doing is, may I ask, please ignore everything other than the catchall at the bottom. We are not proposing anything where it says final, all I am suggesting is we ignore everything above the word developer at the bottom.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Okay.

MR. FIRSEL: So, what I am suggesting is that the language Charles has proposed and we agree to not be put at, as an additional sentence of 12D, but at that, it be put where I have it so it will apply all of section 12.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: The Village's proposed language instead of the paragraph you have written here?

MR. FIRSEL: Correct.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: With the amendment that has just been discussed.

MR. FIRSEL: That is 100 percent correct, Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Okay, that's fair.

MR. WITHERINGTON-PERKINS: Yes, we haven't, it doesn't matter to us. The intent was it would apply to, that's how we're viewing it anyway.

MR. FIRSEL: Yes.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: No, that's, that clarifies and explains what we're amending.

MR. FIRSEL: So, with that language that has been put on the record by Charles and to which we have agreed, we have no issues with any of the conditions of approval that have been presented by Staff.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Well, I'd like to go back to Chairman Ennes' comment. I don't know why we would have language in there in perpetuity. I mean, it doesn't make any sense and I would like to see that stricken.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: I'm there, but they're willing to accept it.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: They're willing to accept it and the, and the, and language somewhat modifies the perpetuity, so I would leave it.

MR. FIRSEL: I apologize. I use the word permanently instead of in perpetuity, as you can see, shall not be permanently assigned. Which one is it Charles, the 160 A, shall provide 160 spaces for the commercial and guest parking uses on the subject property? They put in perpetuity. Were we to argue about every single condition, I would really be pushing for removal of that, but since we have this catchall, which is meant to cover all of the comments that we would otherwise change, we thought it would be a lot easier to do it this way than go through and burden you this evening with going through each and every one of those 12, each and every one of those conditions with my red lining, which is another slide that I don't want to burden you with. So, this catchall covers everything.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: And to your point, it's on the record. We all understand.

MR. FIRSEL: Sure, we're good.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Substantial compliance is a relatively defined term.

MR. FIRSEL: Yes.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Relatively, George and I could probably argue about it for hours, but still that's what lawyers like to do. And, but it's a relatively defined term and it, and we've, it's on the record. It modifies all of the above, I see where you're, what you're saying.

MR. FIRSEL: Okay, thank you.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Before we go back to audience, which started this --

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: I should have referenced you in that comment as well.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Charles, would you be okay with permanently?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: I just argue with George.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Perpetuity is an awful strong term.

MR. WITHERINGTON-PERKINS: I mean, I would argue, if the project is approved with these plans, those are the plans. So, whether it says permanent or perpetuity, it means the same thing. If they want to change it substantially, they have to come back and amend the plan. If it's a change that's deemed to be in substantial compliance, that's how we treat every project.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: I think that's the substantial element.

MR. FIRSEL: So, you wouldn't have any problem changing it to permanently then?

MR. WITHERINGTON-PERKINS: It could be permanently, it means the same thing to us, yes.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: But substantial, you take away one spot, you're not going to go take him to court.

MR. WITHERINGTON-PERKINS: Right.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: That's, that's what substantial is what we're talking about, you take away 10 spots, we might be arguing. But there's like a wiggle room in there based on marketing conditions and what the usage is that gives some flexibility.

MR. WITHERINGTON-PERKINS: We make those decisions every day.

MR. FIRSEL: But you're okay with permanent?

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, so in the 17th century there was Duke Norfall caused the rule against perpetuity, so --

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Which was on my bar exam, just saying.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay, we're getting off track here. We have a gentleman sitting in the power seat in the audience, the first seat on the left side, is the first person that can speak. You asked the question what we would like to hear about. And we, I think we resolved our biggest issue. Did you still want to ask us any questions or did you want to talk to us about the issues that we're addressing this evening. You need to come forward. Tell us your name, spell it.

AUDIENCE COMMENT

MR. SAMATA: Tom Samata, S-a-m-a-t-a. I live in Arlington right across the street from this place.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay.

MR. SAMATA: Can you put that, I think it was with the architectural plan, I think, the overhead view. Now maybe I missed it back when they had this presentation in the tent but the main exit and entrance to this place is on Campbell, which is also the main entrance and exit to two or three other condo buildings across the street. Isn't that going to get a little bit tight there with traffic? Plus that's Campbell's like a very pedestrian-oriented street, lots of people walk from the houses, from the condos, to Vail and Campbell, which is probably the biggest, busiest corner in the downtown on this side, you know.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: You live on Campbell?

MR. SAMATA: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay, just a comment on that. That's half of it, the other goes, some of this exits out onto Chestnut and out onto Highland, so it's not the only in and out. And the intention was to keep as little out on the Chestnut side where the residential is.

MR. SAMATA: That part I understand. Why wouldn't the main exit and entrance be on Highland, which has very little.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Because it's very busy with all the people coming out of the garage all day every day.

MR. HUBBARD: I can address that if you'd like.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Pardon?

MR. HUBBARD: I can address that if you'd like.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Please.

MR. HUBBARD: There's a condition of approval that if traffic patterns warrant, then the Village can require the developer to make this a two-way entrance exit, whereas today, it's just proposed as an entrance. But a condition of approval allows the Village to require the developer to do that. Furthermore, I would add that this is an entrance/exit to the garage for residents only. The residents who will be living in this building and this building will have access to leave from the garage from here rather than leaving from the garage here and coming here, so that's going to keep most of the exiting traffic off of this intersection right here.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Thank you, Sam, for that. Was there anyone else? Would you please come forward?

MS. DWYER: Terry Dwyer, D-w-y-e-r. I have just actually a couple questions and then a comment. So, my questions would be around the stop signs. Are we making Chestnut and Campbell a four-way stop? Because on any given day, when I try to walk my children across Campbell to get to Jewel or any of the, you know, restaurants and entertainment downtown, we're not able to cross the street because of the traffic coming through. And when you have cars parked on the street, you can't see. There's zero visibility. And even as a car, as you try to cross that intersection, you are halfway in the middle of it before you would be able to see an oncoming car.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Sam, would you comment on the reduced parking that's going to be allowed on Campbell.

MR. HUBBARD: I can address that. The intersection of Highland and Campbell will be a four or three-way stop sign intersection, so you'll just have to cross here and come here and then there will be a stop sign here. You can cross like that. So, you'd have to walk one more block in order to make that crossing.

MS. DWYER: So, to be clear, my kids will have to go a block down just to cross the street to protect them and the community in which we reside, right? Because we can't put another stop sign there?

MR. HUBBARD: Well, there will also be a bump-out here built for the crosswalk, so there will be a little bit more, the width of the street will be constricted a little bit and it will add more protection for pedestrians crossing on this side of the intersection here. The traffic study and the warrants did not show that a traffic signal or a traffic stop sign here was necessary.

MS. DWYER: And may I ask when the traffic study was conducted? Was it during peak hours?

MR. HUBBARD: It was.

MS. DWYER: On the weekend or evenings, Thursday through Friday?

MR. HUBBARD: Yes, it was.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: This was one of the topics we discussed two weeks ago.

MS. DWYER: Right, and actually, that was my other comment that I wanted to make, more of a comment, and not a question. But to the Commissioners, I would respect and ask that you would reconsider your previous motion. The meeting that was held two weeks ago was actually during spring break for all of the residents that reside within the community, so most of which were on vacation and unable to attend. So, I think it's disappointing that we wouldn't be able to have a voice within the process because of the cadence of your meetings. So, if there could be a consideration for those that are in the audience that have prepared --

CHAIRMAN ENNES: We spent, we were here until midnight.

MS. DWYER: And I appreciate that and all respect of your time, we too --

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Can appreciate that.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: So, I can comment on that. I have elementary school children. I'm up here. I volunteer all the time and I planned my vacation to make sure I was here for that meeting. So, I'm just pointing out, you can laugh all you want, but I'm just pointing out, I live in this community. I have young children in this community. It's not ridiculous.

MS. DWYER: It's disappointing. It is what it is. So, define it as what you will.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: That's the way it goes. I'm sorry, but I live in this community too. I live right by a major thoroughfare. My kids can't even walk to the park. There's no stop sign, there's only a crosswalk.

MS. DWYER: So, in this position, you're agreeing to perpetuate an environment --

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: No, I understand how the Village works and how roadways have to work. I understand how these things have to happen. We can't stop everything because schools are on break. We just can't, the community has to move forward.

MS. DWYER: And we're confident that that wasn't planned by design.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: No, it was not planned by design.

MS. DWYER: Because that's what the perception is. That's what the objects are to the community, that that was by design.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Let me just --

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: That's not how it works.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Let me just make a comment.

MS. DWYER: Sure, please.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay, for the people that thought that was funny and wanted to break out in laughter. We volunteer our time to be up here to make this the best community we can be and we're listening, we're offering the time to rehear questions on this project to the community because we think that's the right thing to do. And if we're going to limit that, we've already done this part of our work. I'm not going to stay here until midnight again to redo it.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: We should also mention that you will get another chance to talk to the Board. Because ours is a recommendation, you can come, all of you can come and make any comments you want to the Board. So, we are a recommending body, we're not a deciding body.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: You can consider zoning.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: So, you've not lost your opportunity to have your input with the Board, where it really counts.

MS. DWYER: Okay, thank you.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Chairman, can I ask Sam a follow-up question just on that topic so we can stay on this topic? So, Sam, if there's no warrants for Chestnut and Campbell, are there any kind of, I guess you'd say, you know, where we see some of the enhanced crosswalk features, whether it's kind of flashing pedestrian lights or anything that don't amount to a stop sign but something that residents are able to use that don't require the kind of warrants that we would need for a fully controlled intersection? Is there any kind of intermediate way to maybe help the residents get through that with some additional protection?

MR. HUBBARD: Yes, I mean, we would look into a high-visibility crosswalk at this intersection. I would add that given the offset nature of the intersection with this leg being slightly south and this leg being slightly north, you know, of a stop sign for stop sign control would be difficult to justify here, given the offset and --

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Yes, and I wouldn't, I mean, I get that, that's kind of out of our, that's more I think, the warrants aren't there for that, we're not going to get that. But what I'm saying is even if it's a simple, you know, pedestrian crossing flasher or something that people can feel a little bit safer with, and that gives at least an awareness even if not a fully, you know --

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Can I make a comment on that.

MR. WITHERINGTON-PERKINS: I can just jump in on that. The Village did do a detailed study, hired a consultant to do pedestrian counts and look at where the best place for those type of crossings are, and there have been all sorts of safety concerns with just placing those without having good data, and they did study Campbell Street and recommended one of those pedestrian class of crossings with flashing lights that would be just east of Highland. That's where the majority of pedestrians cross.

So, originally it was going to be in front of Metropolis, because of this development and the traffic at Highland and Campbell, we're going to shift it, redesign it, and shift it to the intersection of Highland and Campbell. So it, and it's expensive to install and design, so it probably wouldn't make sense to do another one just one short block, because these are narrow blocks, west to east, at this location. But as Sam mentioned, there is going to be a bump pad at the corner there that's going to help provide safety and better crossing and the Village will always evaluate, you know, the safety of the intersections as downtown continues to grow and evolve.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Okay, thank you.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Yes, would you please --

MR. PRAXMIRE: My name is Paul Praxmire. I actually live right across the street from the entrance to I think 425 and first I wasn't going to make a comment about it, but as far as the four-way stop, it's not a pedestrian issue, it's a traffic issue. That corner right there, I go through that intersection all the time. During busy times on a Friday night, there's cars parked all the way up to the edge of the corner and that intersection, as you see, it's not exactly a, it's not at right angles.

If you're making a left turn, people are hauling, they have a clear way all the way from Ridge, okay, so they're hauling. You've got people going 40 miles an hour. I know it's 25, but they're going 40. And you go to make that left, there's a blind spot, you pull out, you're going to have accidents there. So, it's not really a pedestrian issue, it's a traffic issue. I mean, after you have two or three accidents, maybe they'll add a stop sign there, but --

CHAIRMAN ENNES: I appreciate your comment, but we're not a traffic Board, we're a, we covering zoning, variations, variances.

MR. PRAXMIRE: Okay.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: And all of these issues, there is a traffic study out there that addresses all of this.

MR. PRAXMIRE: Okay.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: And I do appreciate your comments. I'm downtown quite often and I have to deal with the parking situation.

MR. PRAXMIRE: Sure.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: I have to deal with people who go a little too fast, although I find with the crosswalks there, people are very respectful. I find that.

MR. PRAXMIRE: Yeah, well I just --

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Now, you see people going 40.

MR. PRAXMIRE: That wasn't going to be one of my comments, but I did want to bring it up. Then as far as Chestnut, are you going to be widening Chestnut? Because Chestnut as it is --

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Yes, that was one of the things that was testified to earlier.

MR. PRAXMIRE: Okay, okay, and again, why have the outflow of traffic coming onto a residential street instead of going back through Highland, the commercial area, instead of where everybody is walking and where we live? No comment on that?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: I think they've answered that; it's too much.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: We addressed that.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: We've talked about that, it's too busy

already.

MR. PRAXMIRE: Okay, and then one other very minor thing. I'm sure you know it, but that park across the street, if we want to call it a park, is a big, everybody walks their dog there. Is there any accommodation for where those folks are going to walk their dogs? I mean, there is, there's a ton of, couldn't there be a dog-walking area established there?

CHAIRMAN ENNES: What, on the developer's property?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: There is a dog-walking area for the residents who live there.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Yes, but that's, but they're not --

MR. PRAXMIRE: Okay, and then just my last comment is the esthetics of this building, having it right in front of us, I don't know how many of you have a 13-story building right in front of you, but I would have thought that Arlington Heights, a great town, I'm proud to live here, I would have thought the esthetics of the building, the architecture of it could be a little bit better. That's just a comment. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Mr. Praxmire, I want to make the same comment I made to the, for the other individual. You still can go to the Board, the Board takes up these issues, traffic and everything else. You can make your comment there. You will be heard.

MR. PRAXMIRE: Okay, I intend to.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: They may not agree with you but you will be heard.

MR. PRAXMIRE: I appreciate it and thank you very much for your time. I know you donate your time and it's a thankless job, I am sure. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Can I see a show of hands of how many other people want to make comments. So, we have two people, three people? Okay. If you could follow one another up here so we can move this along.

MR. COON: Well, first, my name is Aaron Coon, I reside at 111 South Highland Avenue.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Can you spell it please?

MR. COON: I'm sorry.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Could you spell the --

MR. COON: C-o-o-n. Right, I am sympathetic to what you guys are going through and I was sympathetic to the late hour, very late hour that you guys stayed in. Very appreciative. I went through all 30 pages of these. I think you guys are doing a fantastic job of covering all of the issues. There are a few that are debatable, you know, and those are the commercial design guidelines. But I would say that the concerns that I have are, well, let me just back up and I think that Mr. Adreani has done a great job at replying to the Village Board decision with the CA Ventures proposal and they took one-and-a-half stories off the Chestnut building. However they put one story onto the Campbell building, but I as an architect and familiar with walking, you know, in urban spaces, when you have a nine-story building next to an eight-story building and then another nine story or eight story, it's part of that urban fabric.

I think that's, I think that's a great plan to react to the residents. The Highland building I do have a problem with but I do recognize the garage, the Vail garage coming up to the property line is a severe impediment on that, on the whole block. But what I feel that, and I think this was touched on at the last Board member, the Village Board meeting,

that it was said by a retired real estate attorney, I think he'd done a lot of work in the Village, I don't remember his name, and I also believe Trustee Blackwood stated to the fact that townhomes wouldn't work. They are known not to work next to a parking garage.

And so and now, tomorrow night, there's a meeting with the Taylor Morrison homes for a four-story townhome project. And so I think that, you know, the variations, and where I'm going with this, the variations that are being asked for the Highland garage, they result in a very small amount of square foot add to the project at the very south end. Now, the reasoning for extending onto the garage was stated so that it would be harmonious with the garage.

But they're going up so high with it, and I think an easy solution would be just to, at the sacrificing of, I don't know, you say you've got six levels parking, if you take eight cars out times those levels, you shift that wall back whether it's 10 feet or 12 feet, and then if you could bring a part of that garage out level with the parking garage as it is now. They did a great job of framing that Highland entry into the garage, right? And so if we took a smaller portion of that garage and mirrored it onto the other side, and let the glass element be a few feet, 10 feet beyond that, then it becomes a backdrop for a wall that is better scaled to a four-story townhome development.

So, I'm not afraid of the 13 stories, it's very reflective of the Dunton Tower project, of the Arlington Town Center project. Now those projects, the Arlington Town Center project, it steps down three times or two times towards the residential neighborhood, but this one is going to have a four-story townhome next to. So, that's your step-down. But what it doesn't do is it doesn't create a harmony or harmonious relationship to the garage. And I don't think that was really touched upon.

And I created just a simple sketch of what that could potentially look like and I'm not trying to design the building, I just did that over five minutes. This is kind of a massing of what that would appear like. So, if you, if you were just to create this wall and then you'd have this all-glass element above, then it starts to, I think, make sense. But when you have, when you have it all flush in a line, I mean, as an architect, I mean, Mr. Green, you know, that when you have a change in material or change in massing, it's usually better to do that in a way that steps in or steps out to break that plane.

And so if we could just break that plane and continue this on over and then take this part and just push it back a little bit, and maybe that part changes to glass, then I think it could be harmonious and then I think it could work the commercial design guidelines, and I think that would be a positive feature. So, the other thing that I wanted to bring up with the parking is I think, or I think his associate had talked about the, I think there was some discussion about that, the midblock cut through and I thought I read that there was not significant benefit to the traffic flow of the development. I'm just wondering if that could be worked out so that it is a one-way out so that people coming out of there can make a right turn onto Campbell and then we get a little bit more space for some retail in the Campbell building.

So, if this development is to, is to bring more residents into our downtown and make it vibrant, wouldn't we want to add more retail and do that in any way that's feasible. So if, if you're, you're trading, you know, circulation with the vehicular traffic and the value of retail, I think maybe there's a compromise if it's not something that's adding a lot to the circulation of the development. So, maybe there's a little bit of a, you know, maybe there's a lot of space under there that's taken up by that midblock. And there's also some cars that are being

lost on Campbell.

But I think to the developer's credit, they've added a lot of parking in the garage. I'm not sure how they did that without changing the size of the building. I'm curious about that. Okay, so and then I think that was most of what I had. There was one other thing. And just, you know, Jim Tinaglia, he came swinging out of the gates and talked about transparency. Transparency for this process. And so I just had some questions for Bill Enright. He said some things that were a little bit confusing in terms of the timeline of the development.

Because at the, at the Plan Commission, at the last Plan Commission for CA Ventures, he got up and said that, that the north part of the property was going to be planned per the master plan at six to eight stories and that he also quoted Bruce Adreani in saying that there's no 140-foot buildings anywhere planned on the site. And 34 days later, they submitted their preliminary design for a five-and-a-half-story, and eight-story, and a 13-story building. So, either Bill is lying or Mr. Adreani was hiding his cards and it's just not --

CHAIRMAN ENNES: You're really way off base for one thing.

MR. COON: No, I'm not really way off base.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: You are.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: So, I don't think this cross-talk is helpful.

MR. COON: Okay, right.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: No there, in the audience. I think he needs to be directed up here and you'll have your turn, but, so guess it's audience cross-talk.

MR. COON: So I guess my question is, I'm not accusing anyone --

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Mr. Chair, I didn't think we were going to redesign the entire building and do all the architectural work. If the Petitioner wants to hire him as the architect, they should do so. I don't know why we're spending Commission time and audience time talking about redesigning this building.

MR. COON: Well, I'm not implying that, but I just curious why --

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Well, you are. You're coming up with drawings and proposals, none of which are involved in the issues that we indicated that we wanted to hear from the neighbors in regard to parking and traffic flow.

MR. COON: Okay, I'll take that back.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: You know what, there's, we have a Design Commission that went through all this design --

MR. COON: Well, they're not allowed to discuss that.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: But neither, you know, we're not involved that.

MR. COON: That's not what Robin Worth said.

MR. ENRIGHT: Chairman, could I address briefly. I take great pride in what I do for the Village. People who know me and work with me know that I don't lie. I'm not perfect, but I don't lie. And what you're referring to was in February of 2018, when the CA Ventures project was before the Plan Commission, I believe it was Commission Drost asked me, so do you know anything about the rest of this block. We had met on a very preliminary basis with Mr. Adreani and Mr. Firsell. At that time, they said we're looking at probably about 12 stories, on my recollection at that time was about 12 stories, 120 feet or so.

Since that time, the project has evolved. They submitted full plans at a higher height, which has been fully disclosed to the public for about eight months.

MR. COON: No, I understand that, but I'm just confused --

MR. ENRIGHT: Don't interrupt, please hear me out, because you accuse me of making statements and I took it as you calling me a liar. So, I'm going to answer --

MR. COON: No, I was quoting the minutes, let the record show I was quoting the minutes.

MR. ENRIGHT: You were not quoting the minutes. Let me be brief. What I said about the eight to 12, six to eight stories was, I did not say the developer said that that's what they were doing. I said that was Staff's position on the project at that point in time because that's what the master plan calls for for this downtown site. Since that time, this project has gone through the public process, it's been vetted, it meets the code for height, it meets the code for density, it meets the code for parking. It meets the code for multiple things. There are some variations for setbacks. I take great exception to you implying that I was purposely misleading anybody in a public meeting. I was not.

MR. COON: Okay, I must apologize. I'm not trying to embarrass you. I'm merely trying to find out why that was said. It was in fact said in --

CHAIRMAN ENNES: This isn't the forum for that.

MR. COON: Okay, I understand. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: This is reminder. We are, we're a Plan Commission, we're here to talk about traffic, parking, zoning requirements, variances, and the topics that we addressed tonight. If you would please tell us your name, we'd like to hear --

MS. DOTY: My name is Lisa Doty, it's D-o-t-y. I am a resident. I live at 24 South Mitchell, which is basically a block west of the development. I would like to thank the Planning Commission, I would like to thank Staff and I would like to thank the developer for all of the hard work, thoughtfulness and effort that has gone into this planning process. As a neighbor, I was very concerned, as everybody else was, but I also want to turn some of the stuff around and say, isn't it great that in 2019 in downtown Arlington Heights, we have a parking problem and a traffic problem.

I've owned my home for 27 years. For 27 years, I have looked at what my husband calls dog poop park. And I walk my dog around that area every single day. I have lived in Arlington Heights almost my entire life. I am so pleased that we are at the point of looking at a development like this. I think that, you know, the developer has gone so far out of his way to address the parking issues. You know, when I looked at the 65-page minutes from the last meeting and I saw that people were quibbling over 21 parking spaces, which based on the real estate tax that are going to be coming in from this, comes out to about \$90,000 per space on the street. Is it really worth us losing that kind of revenue? So I, you know, I heartily, I think this is great project, I hope the Planning Commission, you know pushes this project through to the next step and I am very excited about all of this. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Thank you very much. Good evening.

MR. MEERSMAN: Hello, my name is Donald Meersman, M-e-e-r-s-m-a-n. I live at 202 South on Highland Avenue. I've live there for about 30 years. I lived over on Vail Street for about 10 years. I want to thank the members here for their time. I know this is a huge project. I know there's a lot of moving parts and I want to thank you very much for doing your best to balance all of the different stakeholders. I would like to speak specifically to traffic. I know that the traffic studies have been very extensive and I've been a pedestrian here for a long time.

And I encourage, and this is more to the, to the Staff that tonight we

discussed allowing wiggle room in the future so that the Village can have input. What I'm hoping for is that if the future pedestrian traffic and the future traffic flow calls for it, please err on the side of safety. I understand that the new plan is putting in a four-way stop at Highland and Sigwalt. Thank you very much. We should have had that a long time ago. I understand that we're going to have pedestrian crosswalks installed on Campbell Street. That is also necessary.

Campbell and Chestnut is a tough traffic situation because it doesn't line up right. It's been that way for a long time and this is going to greatly, greatly increase our traffic. Everybody knows that, and you've gone to great lengths to try and address that issue. So, I'm hoping that the Staff will use that same future, they left themselves wiggle room in case the parking slots have to be re-allocated, that's a good idea. Please do the same thing for traffic safety for pedestrians. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Was there anyone else? I'm going to close the public portion of the meeting and go back to the Commissioners for questions of the developer and/or Staff, or any of the people that spoke from the audience? Mr. Jensen?

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: I don't have any further questions.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Ms. Warskow?

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: I don't have further questions.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Any questions?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Is there a motion? I can't make one.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Yes, I'll, are you going to make the motion?

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Yes.

A motion to recommend to the Village Board of Trustees approval of Application PC#19-001., a rezoning from R-3, one-family dwelling district to B-5, downtown district for four lots of the subject property, planned unit development approval to allow a 361 unit mixed-use residential development, preliminary plat of subdivision approval to consolidate the 17 existing platted lots on the subject property into one lot, land use variation to allow residential uses as a principal use in the B-5 district for the proposed building along Chestnut Avenue and the following variations:

1. Variation to Chapter 28, Section 5.1-14.4B, conditions of use, to allow dwelling units below the second floor within the Chestnut Building.
2. Variation to Chapter 28, Section 5.1-14.2A, required minimum yards, to allow a 7' setback along a public street frontage (Chestnut Avenue) for the Campbell Building where code requires a 20' setback.
3. Variation to Chapter 28, Section 5.1-14.2A, required minimum yards, to allow a 12.2' setback along a public street frontage (Chestnut Avenue) for the Chestnut building where code requires a 20' setback.
4. Variation to Chapter 28, Section 5.1-14.2B, required minimum yards to allow a 12.9' setback along an interior lot line (southern lot line) for the Highland Building where code requires a 25' setback.

5. Variation to Chapter 28, Section 10.2-7, size to allow certain parking spaces within the Highland Building Garage to be 15.3' in length where code requires 18' in length.
6. Variation to Chapter 28, Section 6.15.2.2, landscape requirements between zoning districts, to waive the requirements for a 6-foot tall solid screen along the southern property line.
7. Variation to Chapter 29, Section 29-304(L), to allow a 50' wide right-of-way for a local street where code requires a 66' wide right-of-way for local streets, along certain portions of Highland Avenue.

This approval shall be subject to the following conditions.

Fire/Safety Conditions:

1. The Petitioner shall modify the interior access drives as necessary to comply with all fire lane concerns as outlined by the Building Department Fire Safety Division and the Fire Department details shall be provided on all pavers to assure the Village that the pavers will support fire apparatus load and the point load of any fire apparatus outriggers.
2. No structure shall be erected and no obstruction shall be placed in the 26' fire lane that runs between the Chestnut building and Highland Building, unless approved by the Fire Department.

Building Conditions:

3. If a restaurant is constructed on the 13th floor of the Highland Building, it shall provide a full kitchen with black iron equipment.
4. The Petitioner shall enter into an indemnification agreement with the Village should any balcony or portion of the building encroach into the public right of way.
5. All building mounted and site mechanical equipment (meters, panels, utility connections, Fire Department connections, transformers, utility pedestals, etc.) shall be appropriately sited and screened from public view, which shall be at the discretion of the Village. To the best extent possible, these elements shall be internalized within structures.
6. The proposed development shall not damage or threaten the structural integrity of the Vail Avenue garage. Prior to building permit issuance, the Petitioner shall provide a structural analysis and soil borings that addresses potential impacts to the Vail Avenue Garage. The Village reserves the right

to review any proposed modifications to the Vail Avenue Garage the ability to require certain upgrades to the garage as it determined necessary to facilitate the proposed development. The costs of any required modifications to the Vail Avenue Garage shall be borne by the developer, and any required insurance, bonds and deposits shall be developer's responsibility. The Village reserves the right to reject any plans or construction that may negatively impact the Vail Avenue Garage.

Site Conditions:

7. All utility service lines must be underground. Prior to final plat of subdivision approval, the Petitioner shall provide a plan for any overhead utilities that need to be modified to accommodate for the proposed development.
8. The Petitioner shall provide final details on the Chestnut Building Garage ramp wall (materials, height, etc.) prior to final plat of subdivision approval, for review and approval by the Village.
9. Prior to final plat of subdivision approval, the Petitioner shall provide details on all site fencing, including the height, style, and materials of all fences proposed on the subject property. Final fence details shall be subject to review and approval by the Village. Additionally, the loading space screen walls shall be revised to be a solid masonry material to match the buildings. Where applicable, the fence along the southern property line shall be a decorative black metal style open fence.
10. The Petitioner shall explore options to minimize or eliminate the retaining wall along the southern property line, and if it is determined that a retaining wall is necessary, in no case shall this retaining wall exceed 3 feet in height. Additionally, said wall shall be setback from the southern property line no less than one foot to allow for maintenance.
11. The Petitioner shall explore further enhancements to the northeast corner of the site to provide a focal point for this prominent corner.

Parking/loading Conditions:

12. The Highland Parking Garage parking space allocation and management shall comply with the plan prepared by Briarwood Management LLC, dated April 9, 2019, and shall be subject to the following additional conditions:
 - A) The subject property shall provide 160 parking spaces in permanently for the non-residential uses on the subject property, comprised of 134 non-residential only spaces and 26 non-residential/resident guest parking spaces. These spaces shall be located on the lower level,

ground level, level 1.5, and level 2.

- I. These spaces shall not be individually assigned to specific non-residential tenants individuals/employees and shall be open to any non-residential User/customer/employee.
 - II. Leases for non-residential tenants shall specify that parking is provided within the Highland Building Garage and that all employees shall park within the Highland Building Garage.
 - III. Employee parking rates shall not exceed employee parking rates set by the Village for the vail avenue garage.
 - IV. Part time employees of the non-residential uses on the subject property shall be provided free parking within the Highland Building Garage, consistent with the free parking provided by the Village within the Vail Avenue Garage.
 - V. Customer parking for customers and patrons of the non-residential uses on the subject property shall be free.
 - VI. Customer parking shall be restricted to a maximum of 4 hours. There shall be no long-term parking within the 160 non-residential `parking spaces.
- B) The subject property shall provide no more than 347 parking spaces within the Highland Building Garage for the residents within the Highland, Campbell, and Chestnut Buildings.
- I. All residential parking within the Highland Building shall be rented separately and shall not automatically be included with a residential lease.
- C) Valet parking for restaurants on the subject property shall be provided on Thursday through Saturday within the lower level of the Highland Building Garage.
- D) At the request of the Village, the property owner shall provide details and data on the operation and management of the parking within The Highland Building Garage. If parking issues arise, the property owner shall work with the Village to modify the parking plan to Address any such issues, to the satisfaction of the Village. The property owner shall use good faith efforts to implement and enforce said Highland Garage Parking conditions and restrictions, and shall have the ability to adjust the above referenced conditions so long as the project is in

substantial conformance and the development continues to adequately accommodate the developments parking demand to the satisfaction and approval of the Village.

13. No employee or residential parking permits for parking within the Vail Avenue Garage shall be issued to tenants, residents, or guests of the subject property, unless determined acceptable by the Village.
14. Prior to building permit issuance, the property owner shall provide a parking signage plan outlining how shoppers, employees, and residents will be guided to appropriate parking spaces. Signage shall clearly indicate what spaces are available for public customers.
15. Loading operations for the development shall be restricted to the following:
 - A. Commercial restaurants/offices: 7:00am - 3:00pm on Monday through Saturday. No loading permitted on Sundays.
 - B. Residential: 7:00am - 6:00pm on Monday through Saturday.
 - C. Street deliveries shall be prohibited, with exception to the on-street loading space in front of the Chestnut Building.
 - D. All trash shall be loaded onto trucks within the loading area. No on-street trash collection shall be permitted.
 - E. All tenants shall be provided with access to the loading and trash areas.
16. Should portions of the property be sold to separate property owners, the property owner shall draft and record provisions for shared parking, shared access, and shared maintenance of common elements and utilities. Traffic/street infrastructure conditions:
17. Intersection improvements shall be required at the following intersections:
 - A. Highland/Campbell: this intersection shall be under 3-way stop sign control. The developer shall install high visibility crosswalks across Highland within this intersection. The Village shall relocate the proposed midblock crosswalk to the eastern leg of this intersection, which shall extend across Campbell.
 - B. Highland/Sigwalt: This intersection shall be under 4-way stop sign control. The developer shall be responsible for installing high visibility crosswalks within this intersection.

- C. The developer shall install bump-out-s for the on-street parking spaces along the southern side of Campbell Street between Highland and Chestnut. This may include the relocation of an existing fire hydrant and installation of required streetscape improvements. Additionally, the developer shall be responsible for installing bump-outs for the proposed crosswalk at the eastern leg of the Campbell/Highland intersection.
 - D. Bump-outs for the on-street parking spaces along the western side of Highland Avenue between Campbell Street and the access drive to the subject property.
- 18. The developer shall be responsible for the expansion of Chestnut Avenue and installation of the parking lane as depicted on the engineering plans, which shall occur as follows:
 - A. Between Campbell Street and the drive aisle exit of the development as part of Phase One.
 - B. Between the exit drive of the development and the south property line at the earliest of the following:
 - I. During Phase Two of development.
 - II. Concurrent with the widening of Chestnut from Sigwalt Street to the south property line of the subject property. If phase two has not commenced, the curb bump-out may be omitted (but must be constructed when either 23.B.I or 23.B.III have occurred).
 - III. Within four years of adoption of this ordinance.
- 19. Eight feet of land shall be dedicated for public right of way along Chestnut Avenue and along a portion of Highland Avenue, as shown on the preliminary plat of subdivision.
- 20. If it is determined by the Village that there is unsatisfactory circulation and congestion within and through the subject property, the property owner shall modify the driveway access along Highland Avenue so that it can accommodate two-way travel. Prior to making this determination, the Village will consult with the property owner.
- 21. The Petitioner shall provide visible warning beacons on the garage ramp for the Chestnut Building, as well as on the Highland Building Garage entrances/exits, if determined necessary by the Village.

22. The Petitioner shall ensure full streetscape compatibility with the rest of the downtown and shall insure that all disturbed public sidewalks shall be restored in conformance to these standards. Furthermore, prior to building permit issuance, a complete site furnishings package shall be required, for review and approval by the Village.
23. The Petitioner shall revise the one-way exit to Chestnut Avenue to bump-out the curb so that the exit tapers down to discourage southbound egress along Chestnut.

General Conditions:

24. At time of building permit, the Petitioner shall provide a detailed final construction schedule and logistics plan that identifies staging areas, material storage, lane closures, and construction worker parking for review and approval by the Village. Any work taking place within the right of way shall be scheduled to minimize disruption to other businesses and Patrons of the downtown vicinity. Construction traffic shall be limited to pre-approved lanes and locations to be determined by the Village. Emergency access shall be maintained at all times during each phase.
25. The developer shall install and maintain a gateway sign at the northwest corner of the site within the public right-of-way as part of the required streetscape improvements within phase one of development. The design of said sign shall be in substantial compliance to the sign details document dated 4/4/19.
26. Conversion of any building to condominium units shall require an amendment to the PUD and determination of sufficient parking for such change shall be provided to the satisfaction of the Village.
27. Impact fees shall be required in accordance with the requirements of Chapter 29 of the Municipal Code.
28. The developer shall provide the required number of affordable units in perpetuity as per the recommendation from the Village Board.
29. Compliance with March 12th Design Commission motion shall be required.
30. All restaurants shall be required to apply for a special use permit, or shall apply for a special use permit waiver if deemed acceptable by the Village.
31. Medical office uses shall only be allowed after review and approval by Village Staff of their projected parking impact. If it is determined by Staff that parking for medical offices cannot be adequately accommodated on the

subject property, medical office uses shall not be allowed.

32. The Petitioner shall comply with all Federal, State, and Village codes, regulations, and policies.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: 1 through 7, I'm sorry.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Oh, I'm sorry, yes, 1 through 7. The approval shall be subject to the following conditions, 1 through 32, with item 12 being amended to the language agreed upon in the minutes by Charles and Mr. Firsel.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Second.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Can we have a roll call, Sam?

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Drost.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Aye, with comment.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Green.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Jensen.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Lorenzini.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Yes, with comment.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Sigalos.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Warskow.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Chairman Ennes.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Cherwin.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Dawson.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Yes, with comment.

COMMISSIONER DROST: First comment, and taking it as a whole. Some of the concerns that have been expressed over the last two meetings can be fleshed out hopefully will be fleshed out at the Board of Trustees meeting. Two concerns that I have are in the density and also buildings and flexibility in this dynamic development, where it appeared to me that there was maybe too many studios and single bedroom units and that there can be, based on what the market will dictate when this project goes on, that there can be an increase in one bedroom and the two bedroom units. And so that it provides a opportunity for the developer to mix it based on the market along with adding some of the, some ownership elements, too. Primarily the condominium portion of it that's going to be built on Chestnut. And I think it needs to look at mix and to try to balance the mix and recognizing what investment the developer has, and they certainly know more about the market than I do, but those are just sort of the comments I have as it moves forward.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Okay, some of the comments I had was going back to what some of the people in the audience said. I didn't realize it was spring break, I stopped doing spring breaks a while ago, since my son got out of school. So, I certainly didn't know that and, but I can assure you that at least from a technical, professional standpoint, this

project's been reviewed by the Planning Department, Engineering Department, Fire Department, Police Department. It's been thoroughly vetted and it meets all the Village codes. Now some of the residents may not agree to it or like it, but I think it's going to benefit 99 percent of people of Arlington Heights. And the developer, it's his property, it's private property and he has the right to develop it. That's all I have to say.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Thank you. Commissioner Dawson?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: So, I did know it was spring break. But I guess my comment is similar to that, which is that this project isn't perfect for everybody, but nothing will ever be perfect for everybody and when I commented that re-arranged my vacation because it was spring break, I did. I've missed meetings from time to time, but this was an important meeting which was emphasized by Staff at the meeting before this, asking every Commissioner up here to do whatever we could do to be here because of the importance of this meeting. So, I left my home this morning at 8:15, I have three young children and I have not been home yet, and it's almost 9:15.

So, to give the implication that I am somehow up here to be manipulative or to take away from people's ability to communicate or, or discuss their concerns about this Village is extremely upsetting to me. I grew up in this Village; I was born and raised in this Village. I was born in 1972 and I've lived in Arlington Heights pretty much my entire life. I care about this Village and I've seen for the last forty almost seven years many, many variations of this Village. And I care about making sure that what we're doing is the best fit for the Village, but it's not going to be perfect.

You want to talk about flashing yellow lights on a crosswalk? I live right off of Minor Avenue where my children, their entire lives, have had to cross a major thoroughfare to get to a park. We can't put a stop sign there. It doesn't work, it doesn't make sense. You want to put a yield sign or a crosswalk there or just a flashing light, my kids will get run over all day long. My kids have had to, since the day they could walk, learn how to stop and look both ways, because that's safe for them than flashing yellow lights on a crosswalk. Because people blow through stop signs. They blow through stop signs in my neighborhood just as much as they blow through stop signs in your neighborhood.

It's all over this community. It was that way when I grew up, it's that way now. We're doing the best we can up here, and this is a good project for this community, for the benefit of the majority of this community. And I just wish more people could understand, if you had to be on spring break, you can write a letter. We get e-mails, we get letters up here with your concerns. I can't make it to the meeting, here's my concerns. You didn't have to reschedule your vacation, you could still have been heard. People who complained about not being heard have already left the meeting tonight without even fully listening to all of us. That's upsetting to me, for someone again who's been now out of the house for 13 hours and away from my children. So; this is a good, a good addition to the community and if it wasn't, I wouldn't live here and I wouldn't put the amount of hours I put in up here. And that's my comment.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Thanks, Commissioner Dawson. Were there any other comments? Okay.

MR. FIRSEL: We would like to extend our immense gratitude to the Plan Commission, having served on it for eight years personally, been there, done that. I have all the respect in the world for you, for your time, for your commitment, and I cannot begin to tell you how appreciative we are of all the work that the Staff has put in and how far we've come in a

short period of time to get to where we are tonight, and we look forward to being at the Village Board. If people have concerns, we will address them all at that time, but we truly want to thank you from the bottom of our hearts for all of your hard work and your hard work. Thank you. And of course, the members of the community, we appreciate them coming out for or against. We take every comment seriously and we appreciate the efforts and the time that they have spent as well. On behalf of our entire best in class team other than the lawyer, we thank you very, very much for all of your hard work. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: The best of luck with your project. Thank you. Do we have any other business on the agenda?

MR. HUBBARD: We don't have any other business.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Do you have a date for this to go to? Do you have a date for this to go to the Village Board?

MR. WITHERINGTON-PERKINS: Tentatively May 6th.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay, thank you very much. And do we have a motion?

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: I'll make a motion to adjourn.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Second.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: All in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Thank you.

(Whereupon, the public hearing on the above-mentioned petition was adjourned at 9:14 p.m.)

Memorandum



To: Chairman Ennes and Members of the Plan Commission
CC: Randy Recklaus, Village Manager
All Department Heads
From: Sam Hubbard, Development Planner
Date: 4/5/2019
Re: PC #19-001: Arlington 425 – Plan Commission Hearing April 10, 2019

On March 27, 2019, the Arlington 425 project appeared before the Plan Commission for a public hearing, which resulted in a continuance of the application until the April 10th Plan Commission meeting to allow the petitioner additional time to address issues primarily related to parking, loading, and recommended conditions of approval.

On the afternoon of April 3rd, the petitioner submitted a revised application regarding many of the issues raised in the Village's 3rd round of review comments and items that were discussed at the March 27th Plan Commission hearing. All Village departments are currently in the process of reviewing the revised application material.

The petitioners revised submittal included the following:

- Revised architectural, civil, and landscape plans. One of the major changes has been the modification of the underground parking for the Chestnut building, which has reduced the total number of parking spaces within that parking garage from 84 to 58, and an expansion of the underground parking within the Highland building garage to increase the parking capacity from 460 spaces to 507 spaces. In total, the onsite parking has increase by 21 spaces for a total of 565 parking spaces.
- Response to 3rd round Village review comments, including a summary of conditions to which the petitioner objects and revised breakout of the unit mix and parking for each building.
- Parking Allocation and Management Plan prepared by Briarwood Management LLC.

Based on a preliminary review of the revised submittal, staff has prepared the following:

- Revised peak shared parking demand charts reflecting the newly proposed changes to the parking areas.

- Internal loading space exhibits presenting two alternatives for removing the two loading spaces proposed along Highland Avenue and relocating them within the interior of the site. The Staff Development Committee still believes that these loading spaces should be internal to the site.
- Conceptual design for the requested gateway sign at the southeast corner of Campbell Street and Chestnut Avenue. The Staff Development Committee is still recommending that the developer pay for and construct this sign (which will not require an easement since it will be within the public ROW). This design is consistent with what the developer of Arlington Towne Square paid for and installed when that development was built.

Recommendation:

Due to the significance of this project, which will have an important and lasting impact on downtown Arlington Heights, sufficient time is required to conduct a comprehensive and thorough review of the materials that were recently resubmitted. The Staff Development Committee is continuing to evaluate the revised submission, and further modifications will be required to the potential conditions of approval and further clarifications will be needed to the Parking Allocation and Management Plan. As such, the Staff Development Committee may not be in a position to make a recommendation on this project at the April 10th Plan Commission meeting and an additional continuance to the April 24th Plan Commission meeting may be necessary. Further updates will be provided at the Plan Commission hearing on April 10th.




VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS **STAFF DEVELOPMENT** **COMMITTEE REPORT**

File Number: PC 19-001
Project Title: Arlington 425
Address: Campbell/Highland/Chestnut
PIN: Multiple PIN's

To: Plan Commission
Prepared By: Sam Hubbard, Development Planner
Meeting Date: March 27, 2019
Date Prepared: March 22, 2019

Petitioner: CCH LLC
Address: 838 Busse Highway
 Park Ridge, IL 60068

Existing Zoning: B-5: Downtown District
 R-3: One Family Dwelling District
Comprehensive Plan: Mixed-Use



SURROUNDING LAND USES

Direction	Existing Zoning	Existing Use	Comprehensive Plan
North	B-5: Downtown District, R-7: Multi-Family Dwelling District	Multi-family residential building, Mixed-use multi-family residential building	Downtown
South	R-3: One-Family Dwelling District	Vacant land	High-Density Multi-Family
East	B-5: Downtown District, P-L: Public Lands District	Mixed-use multi-family residential building, Public parking garage	Downtown, Government or Institutional
West	R-6: Multi-Family Dwelling District, R-3: One-Family Dwelling District	Parking Lot, Single-family homes	High-Density Multi-Family, Single-Family Attached

Requested Action:

1. Rezoning from R-3, One-Family Dwelling District to B-5, Downtown District for four lots of the subject property.
2. Planned Unit Development approval to allow a 361-unit mixed-use residential development.
3. Preliminary Plat of Subdivision approval to consolidate the 17 existing platted lots on the subject property into one lot.
4. Land Use Variation to allow residential uses as a principal use in the B-5 District for the proposed building along Chestnut Avenue.

Variations Required:

1. See **Appendix 1**.

Project Background:

The subject property is 2.87 acres (124,964 square feet) in size and located along Campbell Street between Highland Avenue and Chestnut Avenue in Downtown Arlington Heights. The property makes up the northern three quarters of what is known as “Block 425”, which is the large piece of vacant land bounded by Sigwalt Street, Campbell Street, Highland Avenue, and Chestnut Avenue. The majority of the property is within the B-5, Downtown District, with a small portion at the southern end of the site within the R-3, One-Family Dwelling District. One of the Board’s 2017 Strategic Priorities is to facilitate development of this block. This is a long awaited development proposal that will help further energize downtown and provide long-term positive economic benefit to the downtown area and community at large.

The proposed development involves the construction of three buildings on the site; one building along Chestnut Avenue, one building along Campbell Street, and one building along Highland Avenue. The developer is proposing a four-story residential building on Chestnut Avenue and a nine-story residential building along Campbell Street with commercial/office uses within the basement, 1st, and 2nd floors. A 13-story building is proposed along Highland Avenue adjacent to the Vail Avenue garage, which would include a small space for ground floor commercial and six floors of parking with residential units above. The 13th floor would house the amenity space for this building, and the developer has indicated that it could also house an approximately 2,500 square foot restaurant should the developer locate a tenant that is interested. The Highland building would also include one additional level of parking below grade. A basement connection between the Highland Building and Campbell building would allow travel between the two buildings.

Residential units in all buildings would be rental. The project would proceed in two phases; the petitioner anticipates construction of both the Campbell and Highland buildings (along with the associated parking structure and site improvements) as part of the first phase of development, and the final phase of development would be construction of the Chestnut building. The developer has stated that when the Chestnut building is constructed, there is a possibility that it may be constructed as a condominium. This would be determined based on market conditions at the time of construction.

The site would be designed with an interior motor courtyard, which would have access from both Campbell Street (via a porte-cochere under the Campbell building) and Highland Avenue. The Campbell Street access point would allow both ingress and egress, and the Highland Avenue access point would be inbound only. The interior motor court would also have an exit on Chestnut Avenue. From the motor court, access to the Highland building garage would be located along the northern façade of that building. Parking for the commercial/office and residential uses within the Campbell building and Highland building would take place within the Highland garage. A total of 460 parking spaces are proposed within this garage for the 307 residential units located in these two buildings plus their 43,817 square foot space for commercial and office tenants/customers. The Highland building garage would also contain an entrance/exit directly to Highland Avenue that would feed onto Highland Avenue where Highland Avenue goes through the Vail Avenue garage. Access to this entrance/exit would be restricted to only the residential uses within the two buildings via a key FOB system. Exact details have not been provided on how the parking system will be managed. Approximately 80 bicycle parking spaces would be provided within the Highland building garage.

The Chestnut building would have its own separate access point from the rest of the development, which would be located along Chestnut Avenue and would lead to two levels of underground parking. The

Chestnut building parking garage would contain 84 spaces to serve the 54 units within the building. Access to the Chestnut building garage would be for only the residential tenants of that building.

The interior of the site would contain seven loading/drop-off/parcel delivery berths. In addition, the developer is proposing two interior/recessed loading berths within the Highland building that would have access from Highland Avenue where the street goes through the Vail Avenue garage. The Chestnut building would have one on-street loading zoning located along Chestnut Avenue at the front entrance to that building.

The property is adjacent to the B-5 district along the north and eastern sides of the site, therefore petitioner will construct a “downtown” style streetscape along these areas. This will include a large brick paver parkway/sidewalk, planter boxes, bike racks, ornamental streetlights, and street trees. Currently, there are nine on-street parking spaces along the south side of Campbell abutting the subject property, and 31 parking spaces abutting the subject property along the western side of Highland (seven north of the Vail Avenue garage and 24 within the Vail Avenue garage). Some of these spaces will be removed to accommodate for the proposed development, which will be discussed in the Traffic/Parking/Loading section of this report.

Two hour street parking is permitted along the eastern side of Chestnut Avenue abutting the subject property, which provides enough space for approximately 13 cars to park in this area. However, the pavement width of Chestnut Avenue is only approximately 23 feet wide, which is not a sufficient width to allow for adequate two-way travel along this street when a car is parked on the eastern side of the street. The developer would not alter the width of this street, but would create recessed parking spaces along the length of the subject property, which would allow for sufficient two-way travel when cars are parked. In addition to the proposed on-street loading zone in front of the Chestnut building, the eastern side of the site would provide a total of ten on-street recessed parking spaces. The streetscape along Chestnut would not be the “downtown” style streetscape proposed along Campbell and Highland; instead, it would be a traditional streetscape with a five-foot wide sidewalk and parkway.

The proposed Campbell and Highland buildings will be mixed-use. Although no tenants have been signed, the developer anticipates the following uses within the business spaces as shown in **Table 1** below:

Table 1 – Estimated Business Space Usage

	Restaurant (sq. ft.)	Office (sq. ft.)	Retail (sq. ft.)	Total (sq. ft.)
Campbell Building				
Basement	-	-	7,376	7,376
1st Floor	7,958	-	7,028	14,986
2nd Floor	1,617	7,469	7,000	16,086
Highland Building				
1st Floor	-	-	2,869	2,869
Rooftop	2,500	-	-	2,500
TOTAL	12,075	7,469	24,273	43,817

A summary of the key development attributes is shown in **Table 2** on the following page:

Table 2 - Key Development Attributes & Code Analysis

	Chestnut Building	Campbell Building	Highland Building	Total
Total Number of Units	54	182	125	361
Studio/1-Bdrm	24	140	101	265 (73%)
2-Bdrm	30	42	24	96 (27%)
Commercial (Sq. Ft.)	-	30,978	5,369	36,348
Office (Sq. Ft.)	-	7,469	-	7,469
Height	47.5'	101'	140'	-
Overall Number of Bedrooms	84	224	149	457
Bedrooms Per Unit	1.55	1.23	1.19	1.27
Code Analysis				
Setbacks	Proposed			Required
North	-	0'	-	0'
South	29.2'	-	12.9'	25'
East	-	7'	0'	0'
West	12.2'	7'	-	20'
Dwelling Units Per Acre	131			-
Minimum Lot Size (density)	119,753 sq. ft.*			117,900 sq. ft.
F.A.R.	314%			None
Building Lot Coverage	60%			None
Impervious Surface Coverage	85.93%			None
Total Parking Spaces	544			455
Parking Spaces Required (residential)				385
Parking Spaces Required (commercial/office)				70

*Lot size post dedication.

Preliminary Actions:

The developer has been through several steps in order to finalize their plans to appear before the Plan Commission. These steps are summarized below:

- **Preliminary Staff Review:** As is customary with larger developments, the petitioner met with staff on several occasions to discuss their initial proposal. Conceptual plans were submitted to the Village for review, and on May 1, 2018, Village staff provided the petitioner with preliminary review comments on the proposal.
- **Meetings with Elected Officials:** Staff reviewed the conceptual plans in one-on-one meetings with the Mayor and individual Trustees and provided informal feedback from these meetings to the developer for their consideration.
- **Neighborhood Meeting:** On September 9, 2018, the developer hosted an open house for members of the public to introduce the proposal to the surrounding neighborhood and receive preliminary feedback from the public regarding the proposed development. Invitations for this open house were mailed to approximately 830 households located within the vicinity of the development. A summary of the open house is included within the materials provided to the Conceptual Plan Review Committee.

- Early Review with the Village Board: On October 1, 2018, the petitioner appeared before the Village Board for an early review, where they received preliminary feedback on their proposal. The minutes from the meeting are included in the packet provided to the Plan Commission.
- Ongoing Staff Preliminary Review: Upon conclusion of the Early Review, the petitioner met again with staff to discuss revisions to their initial proposal. In addition, the petitioner worked individually with multiple Village Departments to understand various code requirements and their applicability to the development.
- Conceptual Plan Review Committee: The petitioner appeared before the Conceptual Plan Review Committee on December 12, 2018. The Committee had questions about parking and loading, specifically, how loading and move-ins/move-outs would function and the ability of the development to accommodate public parking within their private garage. The Committee also expressed a strong desire to see affordable units included within the development as opposed to a fee-in-lieu of these units. There was also discussion on the architecture of the buildings, the internal circulation and the ingress/egress along Campbell, and the variation to waive ground floor retail within the Chestnut building. The minutes from this meeting are attached.
- Plan Commission Application: A completed Plan Commission application was submitted on January 17, 2019.
- Design Commission: The petitioner has met three times with the Design Commission, with the final meeting occurring on March 12, 2019. The Design Commission voted 4-1 in favor of a recommendation of approval, subject to certain requirements and recommendations relative to signage, building materials, building mounted utility equipment locations/screening, and accent colors. Compliance with the Design Commission approval shall be required.
- Housing Commission: Prior to Village Board consideration, the Housing Commission will meet to discuss the developer's affordable housing proposal.

Downtown Master Plan and Building Height:

The Downtown Master Plan, as amended in 2007, outlined several development parameters for each block within Downtown Arlington Heights. This plan calls for Block 425 to be developed in a cohesive manner, with the northern three-quarters of the block (the subject property) designated with a height limit of 6-8 stories and the southern quarter of the block to be 4-6 stories in height.

While the Chestnut building is consistent with this plan, the proposed height of the building along Highland Avenue is not. The existence of the five-story Vail Avenue garage structure that is built up to the property line of the subject property adjacent to the proposed Highland building, provides rationale for the proposed 13-story height of this building, which building complies with the height regulations of the B-5 district. In order to overcome the obstacle of the abutting five-story garage structure, the developer believes that the 13-story height of the Highland building is necessary.

The Campbell building is substantially consistent with the height guidelines outlined in the Downtown Master Plan, which call for a maximum building height of eight stories. This eight-story guideline applies to the entire site, and rather than have an eight-story structure adjacent to the single-family homes to the west, the developer has proposed a four-story building in that location (which was reduced from a previously proposed height of five and a half stories). To compensate for the reduced height in that location, the height of the Campbell building was increased from eight stories to nine stories, which the Staff Development Committee believes to be appropriate. Staff notes that the property directly west of the Campbell building is zoned for multi-family uses, and the properties to the north and east are mid-rise buildings of a compatible scale.

The maximum building height within the B-5 District is 90 feet, however, the B-5 regulations allow buildings up to 140 feet tall provided that they qualify for certain height bonuses as outlined within the Zoning Code. The Chestnut building conforms to the height regulations of the B-5 District without the need for height bonuses. Based on a detailed analysis, both the Campbell building and the Highland building qualify for height bonuses, and the height of those buildings therefore comply with the maximum permitted height within the B-5 District. Although the Highland building exceeds the height guidelines of the Downtown Master Plan, it conforms to the height requirements of the zoning district in which it is located. A detailed analysis of the qualifying height bonuses of the Highland and Campbell buildings is contained at the end of this report in **Appendix 2**.

Zoning and Comprehensive Plan

As identified above, there is a small portion at the southern end of the site that is zoned R-3, One-Family Dwelling District and petitioner is requesting to rezone this property to the B-5, Downtown District. Staff is supportive of said rezoning as it is consistent with the surrounding zoning to the north and east and is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, which designates the site as Mixed-Use.

The B-5 District requires that all developments over 500 square feet in size receive PUD approval, and therefore the petitioner has requested approval as a Planned Unit Development. Additionally, the site is currently composed of 17 previously platted lots that must be consolidated into one lot for the proposed development. Finally, since the B-5 District prohibits buildings that contain only residential units, the petitioner is seeking approval of a land use variation to allow the Chestnut building as a single-use residential building.

As will be outlined below, there are certain variations that are required in conjunction with the proposed development. For each variation requested, the petitioner has submitted a written response addressing the four criteria necessary for variation approval, which have been summarized below:

- **The proposed use will not alter the essential character of the locality and will be compatible with existing uses and zoning of nearby property.**
- **The plight of the owner is due to unique circumstances, which may include the length of time the subject property has been vacant as zoned.**
- **The proposed variation is in harmony with the spirit and intent of this Chapter.**
- **The variance requested is the minimum variance necessary to allow reasonable use of the property.**

The petitioner's response to the above approval criteria has been included within the packet provided to the Plan Commission. With regards to the use of the Chestnut building, the following variation is required:

- **Land Use Variation to allow residential uses as a principal use in the B-5 District for the proposed building along Chestnut Avenue.**

The B-5 district is designed to encourage high-density mixed-use developments that foster pedestrian traffic and provide walkable commercial/service related businesses within downtown Arlington Heights. As such, single-use multi-family developments are prohibited in the B-5 district. Since the Chestnut building is proposed as a single-use multi-family structure, the aforementioned land use variation is required. The Staff Development Committee is supportive of this variation for the following reasons:

- The subject property is unique in that it is one of only two properties within the entire B-5 district that is adjacent to an R-3, single-family zoning district.
- Given that Chestnut Avenue has single-family homes on the western side of the street adjacent to the Chestnut building, a mixed-use building that would bring more vehicular and pedestrian traffic to this area would not be compatible with the existing uses of nearby property.
- One of the purposes of the Zoning Code is to “protect the character and stability of the residential” areas of the Village. By restricting the Chestnut building from developing as a mixed-use building, the character and stability of the single-family homes on the western side of Chestnut Avenue will be protected.

Analysis of the other variations will be provided throughout this report.

PUD Variations

For variations requested in conjunction with a PUD, the variations must meet a certain set of criteria as outlined in Section 9.5 of the Zoning Code. Specifically, this section states that the Plan Commission has the authority to grant variations within a PUD if such variations “will not exercise a detrimental influence on the surrounding neighborhood”, and that “variations shall be justified when the other characteristics of the development exceed the minimum standards of the Municipal Code.” In their consideration of PUD variations, the Plan Commission shall contemplate the following items relative to the development:

- **The provision for indoor and outdoor recreations facilities, which should be proportional to the size and density of the Planned Unit Development.**
- **The conservation of natural resources such as flood plains, wet lands and wooded areas.**
- **As much as possible, the preservation of the natural drainage and floodwater retention.**

In regards to these standards, the following points were considered:

- The proposed development is designated as appropriate for B-5 zoning per the Comprehensive Plan. The B-5 Zoning district allows structures up to 90 feet in height by right, and with height bonuses a building height of 140 feet can be achieved. In an effort to avoid detrimental influences on the surrounding neighborhood, the petitioner has proposed a 47.5’ tall building along Chestnut Avenue adjacent to the existing single-family homes along this street.
- The interior courtyard between the Highland building and Chestnut building provides open space for outdoor recreation. The southern portion of this area includes decorative courtyard lighting, lounge areas, and a firepit (subject to final approval of the fire lane limits).
- All three buildings contain outdoor rooftop decks for additional outdoor recreation. These areas will include pergolas, lounge chairs, outdoor grilling areas, outdoor kitchen areas, and fireplaces/firepits.
- Each building has interior areas for indoor recreation. The 13th floor of the Highland building will serve as the development amenity center. This space will include a fitness center, business center, conference/party room, and an internet lounge. The basement of the Campbell building will provide a space for dog washing. The Chestnut building will have two first floor amenity rooms for a total of 1,596 square feet of amenity space.
- The developer has proposed a green roof on each of the three buildings. Green roofs are encouraged for their impact on stormwater runoff and their aesthetic value, but are not required by code.

- There are no natural features on the property that warrant conservation of wetlands and wooded areas.
- The proposed building will incorporate an underground detention vault that will capture stormwater runoff. Permeable pavers will be used extensively throughout the site. The existing site does not have any area that provides notable floodwater retention.

Plat of Subdivision

The petitioner has submitted the Preliminary Plat of Subdivision showing the consolidation of the 17 lots into one lot. Should the project be approved by the Village Board, the petitioner will need to reappear before the Plan Commission for review of the Final Plat of Subdivision once final engineering plans have been prepared, the plat has been printed on mylar (with all applicable signatures obtained), and any outstanding issues that may be identified in the conditions of approval have been addressed. As part of the subdivision the petitioner is required to dedicate eight feet of land on both the east and west side of the subject property for roadway Right-of-Way purposes. A condition of approval requiring this dedication has been included in the recommendation at the end of this report.

Staff has reviewed the Plat and found it in compliance with all applicable codes, with exception to the dedication of land along Highland Avenue. Relative to this dedication, the following variation is required:

- **Variation to Chapter 29, Section 29-304(I), to allow a 50' wide right-of-way for a local street where code requires a 66' wide right-of-way for local streets, along certain portions of Highland Avenue.**

The current width of Highland Avenue is 50 feet, however, the subdivision regulations require that this street be 66 feet in width. Anytime a subdivision is proposed, if the abutting right-of-way is less than the width required by code, the necessary land to achieve the required right-of-way width must be dedicated (in this case eight feet of right-of-way must be dedicated along Highland and Chestnut). The plat shows the required eight feet of dedication along Chestnut, however, along Highland the eight foot dedication does not occur where the property abuts the Vail Avenue garage. Since expansion of the street in this location is not possible given the location of the Vail Avenue garage, the petitioner has asked that the eight-foot dedication not be required where abutting the garage. The Staff Development Committee is supportive of this variation and agrees that expansion of Highland Avenue within the Vail Avenue garage is not possible, making the right-of-way dedication unnecessary where abutting the garage.

Affordable Housing

Affordable units must be provided pursuant to the Village's Multi-Family Affordable Housing Policy, which is a requirement for all Planned Unit Developments. Staff and the developer are in ongoing discussions regarding this matter, which will need to be resolved prior to appearance before the Village Board.

Market Study and Economic Analysis

The petitioner has submitted a comprehensive market study that analyzed the local market conditions and evaluated the proposed development in relation to potential competitors. The study has found similar developments in the Northwest Suburban Cook County submarket to be at 94.5% occupancy, noting that 95% occupancy is considered full. The study finds that the relatively "full" state of the market means that pricing will remain stable, although it does acknowledge that there are over 1,000 units currently under construction within the submarket. However, even in considering the units currently under construction, the study suggests that the development will lease up at a rate of 10-20 units per month, meaning that

the first phase of the development will achieve stabilization sometime between 15 and 29 months after completion.

Staff has completed an estimated Village economic development impact relative to proposed project, which will provide economic benefits in the form of property taxes, impact fees, and the spending activities of the developments' residents within the community. This estimated economic impact can be found within **Appendix 3** at the end of this report, and a summary is included below in **Table 3**.

Table 3 – Fiscal Impact; Revenue

Village Share of Real Estate Taxes (annual)*	\$165,084-\$173,817
Impact Fee's (one-time)	\$1,025,186
Annual Resident Spending (within 3 miles)	\$5,279,964

*The above estimate is a conservative analysis. A complete and accurate estimate cannot be generated since the cost of construction is unknown.

Although there are costs associated with residential developments, staff notes that the proposed development will not likely house many families with children, which will reduce the impact of the development on local schools. Additionally, the proposed development does not include any dedicated senior housing and staff does not anticipate a substantial amount of ambulance service calls.

Overall, the development will provide a positive economic boost to Downtown Arlington Heights. The proposed units will include high-quality finishes and the development will have luxury amenities. With average rents projected at \$2.32 per square foot (approximately \$1,550 for a studio, \$1,850-\$2,150 for a 1-bedroom unit, and \$2,400-\$2,600 for a 2-bedroom unit), tenants are expected to have significant spending power to contribute to local restaurants, retail stores, and services.

Impact on School Districts

Given the high proportion of studio and one-bedroom units (74% of the overall unit mix), it is expected that the proposed development will have a negligible impact on local school enrollment and a positive fiscal impact. Based on the formula that School District #25 uses to estimate future enrollment, staff has projected that the proposed development would yield approximately 10.7 elementary aged children, 10.7 middle school aged children, and 10.7 high school aged children, for a total of 32 additional students within the local school system. However, it should be noted that when the same formula is applied to both Dunton Towers and Hancock Square, the actual number of students is significantly less than projected enrollment. Staff reached out to School District #25 to solicit their feedback on the proposal and they did not express concerns with the development.

Construction Staging

The petitioner has provided a preliminary construction staging plan as part of their Plan Commission application. As part of building permit review, the petitioner shall provide a final construction schedule and logistics plan that identifies staging areas, material storage, lane closures, and construction worker parking for review and approval by the Village. Any work taking place within the right of way shall be scheduled to minimize disruption to other businesses and patrons of the downtown vicinity. Construction traffic shall be limited to pre-approved lanes and locations to be determined by the Village. Emergency access shall be maintained at all times during each phase. The preliminary staging plans shows an area for truck staging along the southern portion of Chestnut Avenue adjacent to the single-family homes in this location. This area shall only be used for temporary staging of trucks for short periods of time as they await

access to the site through the gate along Chestnut Avenue. No long term staging of trucks shall occur in this area.

Variation Analysis

As stated above, the petitioner has requested several variations in order to facilitate the proposed development. This section will address each of the variations in relation to the criteria necessary for variation approval. The first variation relates to the residential use of the Chestnut building:

- **Variation to Chapter 28, Section 5.1-14.4b, Conditions of Use, to allow dwelling units below the second floor within the Chestnut building.**

As previously mentioned, the B-5 district is designed to foster a walkable urban environment, and one way that this is achieved is through the location of commercial/service uses on the first floor of buildings with residential units above. The restriction on residential units below the second floor of the building is meant to preserve space for a mix of other uses traditionally found in downtown suburban environment. The Staff Development Committee supports this variation for the same reasons that it supports the land use variation to allow the Chestnut building to be a multi-family structure.

Setback Variations

Relative to building setbacks, the following variations are required:

- **Variation to Chapter 28, Section 5.1-14.2a, Required Minimum Yards, to allow a 7' setback along a public street frontage (Chestnut Avenue) for the Campbell building where code requires a 20' setback**

The Staff Development Committee is supportive of this variation for the following reasons:

1. The B-5 regulations state that a 20-foot side yard setback is required “where 50% or more of the property directly across the street frontage is zoned R-3”. Since over 50% of the property on the western side of Chestnut is within the R-3 zoning district, the 20-foot setback is required. However, the portion of property directly to the west of the Campbell building is within the R-6 zoning district. Although the strict application of the code requires the 20-foot setback along the entire western side of the site, the property directly adjacent to the Campbell building is not within the R-3 district. **Appendix 4** at the end of this report illustrates this relationship.
2. The property immediately to the west of the proposed Campbell building is currently vacant and owned by the petitioner. One of the purposes of the zoning code is to “protect the stability of the residential, business, and manufacturing areas within the Village and to promote the orderly and beneficial development of such areas. Should the setback variation create a situation that would threaten the essential character of the locality or orderly and beneficial development, it is not likely that the petitioner would propose such a setback, which would have the most impact on property they own directly to the west.
3. The substandard width of Chestnut Avenue is a unique circumstance that requires the dedication of eight feet of land along the western side of the site. Absent this dedication, the extent of the setback variation would be significantly reduced (from a 13-foot variation to a 5-foot variation).

- **Variation to Chapter 28, Section 5.1-14.2a, Required Minimum Yards, to allow a 12.2' setback along a public street frontage (Chestnut Avenue) for the Chestnut building where code requires a 20' setback.**

The Staff Development Committee is supportive of this variation for the following reasons:

1. The petitioner is required to dedicated eight feet of land along Chestnut Avenue for additional right-of-way. Had this dedication not been required, the Chestnut building would conform to the setback regulations of the B-5 district. This unique circumstance is not characteristic of other properties within the B-5 district.
2. In order to preserve sufficient separation between the Chestnut building and Highland building (for aesthetic purposes) and to provide adequate space for a fire lane in-between these two buildings, the Chestnut building has been located within the required 20-foot setback area.
3. Given the proposed height of the Chestnut building, at 47.5 feet tall, the 12.3-foot setback is appropriate given that the closest single-family home on the western side of Chestnut is located approximately 85 feet away.

- **Variation to Chapter 28, Section 5.1-14.2b, Required Minimum Yards, to allow a 12.9' setback along an interior lot line (southern lot line) for the Highland building where code requires a 25' setback.**

The Staff Development Committee is supportive of this setback variation for the following reasons:

1. The existing Vail Avenue garage, which directly abuts the eastern edge of the subject property, is a unique site characteristic. This garage is located 12.9 feet from the southern property line. The proposed Highland building would be built at the same 12.9-foot setback from the southern property line, which would allow the two structures to align. The Highland building would not encroach any farther south than the existing setback of the Vail Avenue garage.
2. Although the property abutting the subject site to the south is zoned R-3, the property is classified as appropriate for high density multi-family development by the Comprehensive Plan. Therefore, it is unlikely that the southern property would be developed with anything other than multi-family homes. A 12.9-foot setback from a property line abutting a multi-family development is suitable.
3. The requested variation is the minimum necessary variation to allow the proposed Highland building to align with the existing Vail Avenue garage.

Parking Space Length Variation

Within the Highland building garage, 10 of the 460 spaces (2%) are 15.3 feet in length where code requires these spaces to be 18 feet in length. Therefore, the following variation is required:

- Variation to Chapter 28, Section 10.2-7, Size, to allow certain parking spaces within the Highland building garage to be 15.3' in length where code requires 18' in length.

The Staff Development Committee is supportive of this variation for the following reasons:

1. The subject property would still conform to the parking requirements of the B-5 district even if the substandard spaces were eliminated.
2. The 10 spaces of substandard length will be reserved for compact cars and motorcycles.

3. Access to the substandard spaces will still be suitable given that all drive aisles will conform to the 24-foot wide code requirement.
4. The majority of the substandard spaces will not be high-turnover spaces.
5. The reduced length of the parking stall length is necessary due to the requirement to provide two remote egress points (stairways) within the high-rise structure.

Rear Yard Landscape Variation

The zoning regulations require that all properties within business districts provide a six foot tall screen along any property line that abuts a residentially zoned property. The land abutting the subject property to the south is currently zoned R-3, One-Family Dwelling district. An “open” style fence along the southern property line has been requested by staff. Therefore, the following variation is required:

- Variation to Chapter 28, Section 6.15-2.2, Landscape Requirements between Zoning Districts, to waive the requirement for a 6-foot tall solid screen along the southern property line.

The Staff Development Committee is supportive of this variation for the following reasons:

1. Although the subject property is zoned B-5 along the southern property line adjacent to the Chestnut building, the use of the Chestnut building will be residential only, which is more consistent with R-7 zoning. Had this portion of the property actually been zoned R-7, the screen would not be required.
2. The property to the south is not developed and can provide screening along this boundary between the two properties should it be determined that a screen is warranted at the time of its development.
3. There is not sufficient room to install a landscape screen or berm along the southern property line. Therefore, the only way to meet the screening requirement would be to install a six-foot tall solid fence. Because the retaining wall may be up to three feet in height at certain portions, a six foot tall fence plus three-foot tall retaining wall would create a nine-foot barrier that would be out of character on the otherwise flat lot.

Site & Building Analysis:

Overall, the site is well designed with the tallest building proposed away from the single-family homes to the west and not directly adjacent to the existing multi-family mid-rises to the north and east. The smallest building (four stories) is proposed along Chestnut Avenue on the western side of the site, and the nine story structure is proposed adjacent to the existing five and eight story buildings on the north side of Campbell Street and the eight story building along Highland Avenue. The interior motor courtyard is designed to minimize traffic and loading on public streets. The area to the south of the motor court provides generous landscaping between the buildings and facilitates outdoor recreation for residents of the development. However, there are several areas of the plan that need further modification or require additional information for further analysis. These areas are summarized below.

Fire/Safety Considerations

Fire lane issues have been mostly resolved, however, the petitioner must still provide information to the Fire Department relative to the length of the fire lane between the Chestnut building and Highland building and verification that the brick pavers can support fire apparatus. Prior to building permit issuance, the petitioner will be required to modify the interior access drives as necessary to comply with all fire lane concerns as outlined by the Building Department Fire Safety Division and the Fire Department.

Additionally, the petitioner will need to provide details on all pavers to assure the Village that the pavers will support fire apparatus load and the point load of any fire apparatus outriggers. Finally, details are needed on how the fire lane in-between the Chestnut building and Highland building will be constructed to provide fire access during construction of the underground garage proposed during phase 2 of development.

Building Considerations:

Although a restaurant within the 13th floor is only conceptual at this point, the Staff Development Committee believes that if a restaurant is to locate there, it should provide a full kitchen, which would prohibit the space from becoming more of a bar that could cater in food. A condition of approval requiring such has been recommended below. With regards to the proposed balconies along the front of the Campbell building, if it is determined that any of these balconies encroach into the public right-of-way, the developer would need to enter into an indemnification agreement with the Village to allow for these encroachments.

The ramp walls for the Chestnut building underground garage need additional information relative to materials and height. Given the final slope of the garage ramp, these walls could become a visibility hazard that would prevent drivers from seeing pedestrians entering the sidewalk that crosses the garage ramp. Staff has recommended a condition of approval that would require the developer to provide additional details on this element, for final Village review and approval, prior to Final Plat of Subdivision approval.

Details on the building mounted and ground mounted mechanical equipment and utility connections has not yet been provided. As such, staff recommends a condition of approval that would require all building mounted and site mechanical equipment (meters, panels, utility connections, fire department connections, transformers, utility pedestals, etc.) to be appropriately sited and screened from public view, which shall be at the discretion of the Village. To the best extent possible, these elements shall be internalized within structures.

Vail Avenue Garage:

The petitioner has not provided any structural analysis of the Vail Avenue garage and how the proposed Highland garage can be constructed adjacent to this structure without damaging it. As such, a condition of approval is recommended that would prohibit the development from damaging or compromising the structural integrity of the Vail Avenue garage. Prior to building permit issuance, the petitioner shall provide a structural analysis and soil borings that addresses potential impacts to the Vail Avenue garage. The Village reserves the right to review any proposed modifications to the Vail Avenue garage and the ability to require certain upgrades to the garage as it is determined necessary to facilitate the proposed development. The costs of any required modifications to the Vail Avenue garage shall be borne by the developer, and any required insurance, bonds, and deposits shall be the developer's responsibility. The Village reserves the right to reject any plans or construction that may negatively impact the Vail Avenue garage.

Site Considerations:

The subject property currently has overhead utility lines that run through the center of the site and west across Chestnut Avenue. In order to construct the development, these lines will need to be buried and it is currently unknown if any upgrades to the overhead lines on the western side of Chestnut will be necessary and how service will be provided to the development. Therefore, the Staff Development Committee is recommending a condition of approval that would require all utility service lines to be

underground. Prior to Final Plat of Subdivision approval, the petitioner must provide a plan for any overhead utilities that need to be modified to accommodate for the proposed development.

The Village has recommended additional modifications and site elements relative to the following areas of the plan:

- Gateway sign
- Fence and loading space screening
- Retaining wall
- Landscape elements
- Streetscape Improvements

Traffic/Parking/Loading:

The proposed development will provide an interior motor court area with full access from Campbell through the porte-cochere of the Campbell building, a one-way entrance along Highland, and an exit along Chestnut. The 460-space parking garage within the Highland building will have its primary entry/exit via the interior motor court and will have another entry/exit for residents only along Highland Avenue where this street goes through the Vail Avenue garage. The Chestnut building will have full access along Chestnut leading to its separate 84 parking space garage. The developer has proposed two recessed loading spaces within the Highland building, which would be accessed from Highland Avenue within the Vail Avenue garage. The interior motor court area contains seven additional drop-off/loading/parcel delivery spaces and there would be one on-street loading/drop-off space along Chestnut Avenue.

Traffic

As required by code, the developer has submitted a traffic and parking study, which has assessed access (location, design, and Level of Service), on-site circulation, trip generation and distribution, parking, loading operations, and impacts to public streets. According to the study, during the peak weekday morning and evening rush hours when existing traffic volumes in the vicinity are heaviest (8:00am – 9:00am and 5:00pm – 6:00pm), proposed development will generate 171 new vehicle trips during the morning and 315 new trips during the evening. This data is shown below in **Table 3** below:

Table 3 – Estimated Weekday Peak Hour Trip Generation

Weekday Morning Peak Hour		Weekday Evening Peak Hour		Weekday Daily Trips
In	Out	In	Out	
53	118	190	125	3,653

The directional distribution for these trips shows that 67% (115 trips) of the total morning trips will traverse the intersection of Highland Avenue and Sigwalt Street, and 66% (210 trips) will traverse this intersection during the evening peak. Of these trips, the majority will come from/end up east on Sigwalt to the intersection of Sigwalt and Vail, with a very small amount coming from/going west on Sigwalt or south on Highland (only 10% morning and evening trips would come from/go south of Sigwalt on Highland Avenue).

Highland/Sigwalt

The Highland/Sigwalt intersection is currently under two-way stop sign control along the north/south legs of this intersection. The traffic study reviewed this intersection and concluded that although not warranted for adequate circulation, four-way control at this intersection would improve flow. Given the high volumes of pedestrian traffic that occurs at this intersection, especially during the evening commute when outbound trains arrive in Downtown Arlington Heights, the Staff Development Committee believes that this intersection should be under four-ways stop sign control.

Highland/Campbell

The intersection of Highland Avenue and Campbell Street is currently under singular stop sign on the southern leg for vehicles travelling northbound on Highland. The traffic study estimates that 18% of the total morning peak hour trips will traverse this intersection (32 trips), and 28% of the total evening hour peak trips will traverse this intersection (87 trips). The traffic study found that this intersection would continue operating at an acceptable level of service and therefore no additional traffic control was warranted. The study found that stop signs at the east and west legs of Campbell would improve flow through this intersection, as well as the installation of high-visibility crosswalks. The Staff Development Committee recommended the relocation of the proposed mid-block crosswalk to this intersection.

Porte-Cochere/Campbell Access

As originally designed, the project did not include the proposed porte-cochere entrance/exit along Campbell Street. Without this element, the original configuration showed two-way ingress/egress along Highland Avenue to/from the interior motor court and one-way egress to Chestnut. Based on concerns over traffic congestion along Highland Avenue, the petitioner introduced the porte-cochere element. Staff believes that this change allows for enhanced pick-up/drop-off for the Campbell building, which would occur in the area beneath the porte-cochere, and although traffic projections do not show a high percentage of traffic utilizing the porte-cochere entrance and exit, it will cause a slight reduction in traffic along Highland Avenue. However, it should be noted that the porte-cochere access along Campbell will require the removal of on street parking along the southern portion of this street abutting the subject property. There are currently nine on-street parking spaces located in this area, and the porte-cochere would require the elimination of four (possibly only three in a best case scenario – staff is still analyzing this) of these spaces. Additionally, the introduction of the porte-cochere ingress/egress point disrupts the pedestrian walkability along Campbell as it presents a new curb cut that will allow vehicles to cross the sidewalk.

Campbell Pedestrian Crossing

The Village has been planning for a crosswalk along Campbell Street east of Highland and west of Vail, which was originally planned to be a mid-block crosswalk located approximately 90 feet east of the Campbell/Highland intersection. However, if the Campbell/Sigwalt intersection will be under three-way stop sign control, it is recommended that this crosswalk be located along the eastern leg of this intersection. It should also be noted that the implementation of three-way stop sign control at this intersection will cause the elimination of two parking stalls on the north side of Campbell Street that would be located within this intersection.

Additional Traffic Considerations

With regards to the remaining intersections studied within the traffic impact analysis, all would function at acceptable levels of circulation with no improvements needed. Staff concurs with the traffic study that the remaining intersections will not require any improvements and are sufficient to accommodate for the projected traffic volumes by the development. In order to assist in traffic circulation, the Village is

recommending that the petitioner revise the motor court egress onto Chestnut to bump out the curb line, which will discourage southbound egress from this access point.

The Staff Development Committee analyzed the proposed internal circulation for this development. In order to provide the code required fire lanes, the petitioner has designed the one-way entrance along Highland to be 26 feet in width, which is wide enough to allow for two-way traffic. The developer has stated that the Campbell porte-cochere exit and Chestnut exit will provide suitable egress from the interior motor court and that the inbound only orientation of the drive will keep traffic off Highland, therefore the Highland access point is not proposed as a two-way driveway. However, staff believes that two-way access along this driveway may be beneficial for traffic flow in the future, which would be analyzed after the development has been constructed and is in operation. Therefore, staff has recommended a condition of approval that would require this driveway to become a two-way driveway in the future, at the request of the Village, should it be determined that there is unsatisfactory circulation and congestion within and through the subject property.

Finally, the traffic study has noted that visible warning beacons should be installed at the Chestnut building garage ramp and both ingress/egress points to the Highland garage. A condition of approval requiring these improvements has been included below should they be determined as necessary by the Village.

On-Street Parking

To accommodate the proposed access points into the development, a significant amount of on-street parking will need to be removed. The **Table 6** below illustrates the loss of on-street parking.

Table 6 – On-street Parking Analysis (preliminary and subject to further review)

	Location	Existing Spaces	Proposed Spaces	Net Loss
Highland Avenue	West side of street south of Campbell and north of motor court entrance	7	4	3
	West side of street within Vail Avenue garage	24	13	11 (6 for loading zone 5 for driveway)
Campbell Street	South side of Street between Chestnut and Highland	9	5-6	3-4
	North side of Street between Chestnut and Highland	5	3	2
Chestnut Avenue	East side of street from Campbell to southern property line	13	10	3

The Staff Development Committee recommended revising the Highland building loading zones to the internal courtyard to reduce the loss of six on-street parking spaces and reduce traffic/loading congestion on Highland Avenue.

To accommodate for the proposed loss of on-street parking and to improve the safety and aesthetic of the remaining on-street parking spaces, the Village is recommending that the petitioner install parking space bump-outs along the south side of Campbell and the west side of Highland where these streets abut the subject property. Additionally, the petitioner shall be required to install the recessed parking spaces

along Chestnut Avenues as part of the first phase of development. Finally, since details on the streetscape and street furnishings are still in progress, the Village reserves the right to review and approve all street furnishings prior to building permit issuance.

Off-Street Parking

The proposed development will contain 460 parking spaces within the Highland building garage and 84 spaces within the Chestnut building garage, for a total of 544 on-site parking spaces. The Staff Development Committee believes parking for the Chestnut building to be sufficient. Staff has analyzed parking for the Highland and Campbell buildings using three separate methods:

1. The amount of parking required per Code.
2. The amount of parking required per the Institute of Traffic Engineers (ITE) *Parking Generation Manual*.
3. Data from similar developments within Arlington Heights and surrounding communities.

The key issues relative to parking are:

- Is there sufficient parking within the development to accommodate parking for all uses at peak times. If peak demand cannot be accommodated within the development, parking will overflow into the Vail Avenue garage and to on-street parking spaces, which may have a negative impact on the Village's parking system.
- Is the appropriate per unit parking ratio for the residential uses 1.3 spaces per unit or 1.5 spaces per unit?
- Given the shared parking model, how will parking be allocated and shared within the Highland building garage for the residential and non-residential uses?

Code Analysis

Parking for the Campbell and Highland building, including all non-residential uses in those buildings, will be provided within the Highland building garage. Relative to code requirements, the Highland building garage provides 460 parking spaces where 395 spaces are required by code, for a surplus of 65 parking stalls (shown in **Appendix 5**). When taking into account the required parking for the non-residential uses, 389 spaces are leftover for the 307 residential units, which translates to a rate of 1.27 spaces per unit. Village Code requires 1.07 parking spaces per unit, however, recent surveys of the Vail Avenue garage suggest that parking for residential units may be closer to 1.3 spaces per unit. This is similar to the per unit ratio provided within the recently completed Arlington Downs development.

ITE Analysis

Peak parking demand for the Highland building garage will occur on weekends when there is an increase in commercial parking demand and residential tenants are not at work. Estimated peak parking demand for the non-residential uses, as based on the ITE standards, is well above the 71 spaces required by code (estimated peak demand of 157 spaces during the weekend). These estimates do not factor in the basement retail space shown within the Campbell building floorplans, which would increase this demand. The Staff Development Committee has requested a detailed parking space allocation and management plan in order to evaluate if the Highland garage can accommodate the non-residential demand without impacting the Vail Avenue garage and on-street parking. As a result, the Staff Development Committee is recommending continuance until such plan is provided and evaluated.

The parking study has pointed out that the peak demand for the non-residential and residential uses do not occur at the same time, and staff concurs that peaks will not directly coincide (although there will be some overlap). Therefore, the petitioner has analyzed parking on a shared use model, which has been extrapolated by staff and shown in **Appendix 6** attached at the end of this report. Since the weekend peak is the highest, it was analyzed as a worst-case scenario. Parking was also analyzed at a 1.5 space per unit ratio, which is based on the parking provided at other rental developments in downtown Arlington Heights and at downtown rental developments in similar suburban communities. The data is summarized below:

	Parking Provided	Code Required Parking	ITE Peak Weekend Demand (commercial) + 1.3 Spaces Per Unit*	ITE Peak Weekend Demand (commercial) + 1.5 Spaces Per Unit*
Highland/Campbell Buildings	460 Spaces	395 Spaces	486 Spaces (26 space deficit)	546 Spaces (86 space deficit)
	Parking Provided	Code Required Parking	ITE Peak Weekday Demand (commercial) + 1.3 Spaces Per Unit**	ITE Peak Weekday Demand (commercial) + 1.5 Spaces Per Unit**
Highland/Campbell Buildings	460 Spaces	395 Spaces	470 Spaces (10 space deficit)	531 Spaces (71 space deficit)

* Occurs at 7:00PM

** Occurs at 8:00PM

- Peak commercial demand: 157 spaces at 10:00am
- Peak residential demand: 399 spaces (1.3 spaces per unit) at 10pm-6am
- Peak residential demand: 461 spaces (1.5 spaces per unit) at 10pm-6am

It is crucial that details be provided on how shared parking will function in order for the Staff Development Committee to provide a recommendation on this project. The petitioner must provide a detailed parking plan outlining the following:

- How the spaces will be shared.
- How many spaces will be dedicated to residential and non-residential uses.
- How access to these spaces will be restricted/unrestricted and monitored.
- What fee will be charged for use of each non-residential space.

If rates for parking within the Highland garage are more than rates for parking within the Vail Avenue garage, customers of this development may opt for parking within the Village's public parking system. Until these details are provided by the petitioner for further analysis by the Village, the Staff Development Committee cannot make a final recommendation on this project.

Furthermore, staff believes that the petitioner should make available within the Highland garage a certain number of free spaces for general parking by the public (not just parking for the public that will patronize the businesses within the development). The rationale behind this request is straightforward; since patrons of these businesses will park within on-street parking spaces, if available, prior to parking within the Highland building garage, the petitioner should compensate for the decrease in available street parking. Furthermore, as previously mentioned, the proposed development would result in a loss of approximately 22 on-street parking spaces. Some loss of on-street parking for access points is expected, but should be managed to the best extend possible.

Loading

The site is required to provide six off-street loading areas. A total of seven code complaint loading spaces are provided, where only six are required. The development contains excellent off-street loading and drop-off capacity.

The Staff Development Committee does not support the placement of the two loading zones within the Highland building, which have direct access along Highland Avenue. These spaces should be relocated to the interior of the site to keep loading movements within the site and off public streets. The location of these spaces within the Highland building means that trucks will need to block traffic as they back into/out of the loading spaces. These two loading spaces will cause the removal of six on-street parking spaces within the Vail Avenue garage.

The petitioner must provide the Staff Development Committee with details on how loading will function within the site, include details on trash collection days and times, move-in/out days, times, and locations and any restrictions that would be placed on move-ins and move-outs, and where loading for each building will take place. The petitioner is encouraged to make the Chestnut building garage tall enough to accommodate a small loading truck to keep move-ins/outs off Chestnut Avenue. Prior to making a recommendation on this project, the petitioner must provide staff with a detailed plan on all loading activities that will take place for the proposed development.

RECOMMENDATION

The Staff Development Committee is supportive of the proposed rezoning from R-3, One-Family Dwelling District to B-5, Downtown District for four lots of the subject property, Planned Unit Development approval to allow a 361-unit mixed-use residential development, Preliminary Plat of Subdivision approval to consolidate the 17 existing platted lots on the subject property into one lot, Land Use Variation to allow residential uses as a principal use in the B-5 District for the proposed building along Chestnut Avenue, and the following Variations:

1. Variation to Chapter 28, Section 5.1-14.4b, Conditions of Use, to allow dwelling units below the second floor within the Chestnut building.
2. Variation to Chapter 28, Section 5.1-14.2a, Required Minimum Yards, to allow a 7' setback along a public street frontage (Chestnut Avenue) for the Campbell building where code requires a 20' setback
3. Variation to Chapter 28, Section 5.1-14.2a, Required Minimum Yards, to allow a 12.2' setback along a public street frontage (Chestnut Avenue) for the Chestnut building where code requires a 20' setback.
4. Variation to Chapter 28, Section 5.1-14.2b, Required Minimum Yards, to allow a 12.9' setback along an interior lot line (southern lot line) for the Highland building where code requires a 25' setback.
5. Variation to Chapter 28, Section 10.2-7, Size, to allow certain parking spaces within the Highland building garage to be 15.3' in length where code requires 18' in length.
6. Variation to Chapter 28, Section 6.15-2.2, Landscape Requirements between Zoning Districts, to waive the requirement for a 6-foot tall solid screen along the southern property line.
7. Variation to Chapter 29, Section 29-304(I), to allow a 50' wide right-of-way for a local street where code requires a 66' wide right-of-way for local streets, along certain portions of Highland Avenue.

However, due to unresolved issues relative to parking and loading, the Staff Development Committee cannot make a final recommendation at this time and believes this project should be continued to allow the petitioner additional time to address the following issues:

- a) A detailed parking allocation and management plan demonstrating how shared parking will function within the Highland building garage.
- b) Resolution of the Highland building loading zone and associated loss of on street parking.

Should the Plan Commission wish to consider a recommendation to the Village Board, a list of recommended conditions of approval are included below. Additional modifications to these conditions may be necessary after receipt and review of the detailed parking plan, loading details, and parking space allocations.

Fire/Safety Conditions:

1. The petitioner shall modify the interior access drives as necessary to comply with all fire lane concerns as outlined by the Building Department Fire Safety Division and the Fire Department. Details shall be provided on all pavers to assure the Village that the pavers will support fire apparatus load and the point load of any fire apparatus outriggers. Details on how the underground garage for the Chestnut building will be implemented without removing or altering the fire lane to the west of the Highland building shall be provided.
2. No structure shall be erected and no obstruction shall be placed in the 26' fire lane that runs between the Chestnut building and Highland Building, unless approved by the Fire Department.

Building Conditions:

3. If a restaurant is constructed on the 13th floor of the Highland Building, it shall provide a full kitchen with black iron equipment.
4. The petitioner shall enter into an indemnification agreement with the Village should any balcony or portion of the building encroach into the public right of way.
5. All building mounted and site mechanical equipment (meters, panels, utility connections, fire department connections, transformers, utility pedestals, etc.) shall be appropriately sited and screened from public view, which shall be at the discretion of the Village. To the best extent possible, these elements shall be internalized within structures.
6. The proposed development shall not damage or threaten the structural integrity of the Vail Avenue garage. Prior to building permit issuance, the petitioner shall provide a structural analysis and soil borings that addresses potential impacts to the Vail Avenue garage. The Village reserves the right to review any proposed modifications to the Vail Avenue garage and the ability to require certain upgrades to the garage as it determined necessary to facilitate the proposed development. The costs of any required modifications to the Vail Avenue garage shall be borne by the developer, and any required insurance, bonds, and deposits shall be the developers responsibility. The Village reserves the right to reject any plans or construction that may negatively impact the Vail Avenue garage.

Site Conditions:

7. All utility service lines must be underground. Prior to Final Plat of Subdivision approval, the petitioner shall provide a plan for any overhead utilities that need to be modified to accommodate for the proposed development.

8. The petitioner shall provide final details on the Chestnut building garage ramp wall (materials, height, etc.) prior to Final Plat of Subdivision approval, for review and approval by the Village.
9. Prior to Final Plat of Subdivision approval, the petitioner shall provide details on all site fencing, including the height, style, and materials of all fences proposed on the subject property. Final fence details shall be subject to review and approval by the Village. Additionally, the loading space screen walls shall be revised to be a solid masonry material to match the buildings. The fence along the southern property line shall be a decorative wrought iron style open fence.
10. The petitioner shall explore options to minimize or eliminate the retaining wall along the southern property line, and if it is determined that a retaining wall is necessary, in no case shall this retaining wall exceed 3 feet in height. Additionally, said wall shall be setback from the southern property line no less than one-foot to allow for maintenance.
11. The petitioner shall install the trees and plant mix along the west elevation of 44 S. Highland between the fire lane and the building as part of the phase one landscaping.
12. The petitioner shall explore further enhancements to the northeast corner of the site to provide a focal point for this prominent corner.
13. The petitioner shall comply with all Federal, State, and Village Codes, Regulations, and Policies.

Parking/Loading Conditions:

14. Prior to the SDC being able to finalize a recommendation to the Plan Commission and Village Board, the petitioner shall provide the following:
 - a. A detailed parking plan outlining how parking will function. The plan must explain, in detail, how parking for the commercial, restaurant, and office uses will be accommodated, as well as the residential portion of the development, including details how spaces will be shared, which spaces will be dedicated for specific users (residential, commercial/restaurant/office employees and customers), how access to these spaces be restricted and monitored, what system will be in place to collect payment for parking, and what the anticipated fee for customers and employees of the businesses/offices will be.
 - b. Revised traffic and parking details shall be provided as per the Round 3 comments from the Engineering Division and Planning & Community Development Department.
 - c. A detailed loading plan outlining all loading activities, including days, times, and locations.
 - d. The petitioner shall revise the plans to remove the two loading spaces along Highland Avenue and location within the interior the site.
15. The areas designated for commercial shopper parking shall also be made available for the public at large to park and patronize businesses outside of the subject property.
16. Prior to building permit issuance, the property owner shall provide a parking signage plan outlining how shoppers, employees, and residents will be guided to appropriate parking spaces. Signage shall clearly indicate what spaces are available for public customers.
17. Parking rates for employees within the Highland building garage shall not exceed those offered by the Village for employees within the Vail Avenue garage. Customer parking shall be free within the Highland building garage.
18. All residential parking for the Highland Building and Campbell buildings shall be rented separately and shall not automatically be included within the lease for each unit. Additionally, parking spaces for residential tenants in these buildings shall be unassigned.
19. Loading Operations for the development shall be restricted to the following:

- e. Commercial/Restaurants/Offices: 7:00am – 3:00pm on Monday through Saturday. No loading permitted on Sundays.
 - f. Residential: 7:00am – 6:00pm on Monday through Saturday.
 - g. Street deliveries shall be prohibited, with exception to the on-street loading space in front of the Chestnut building.
 - h. All trash shall be loading onto trucks within the loading area. No on-street trash collection shall be permitted.
 - i. All tenants shall be provided with access to the loading and trash areas.
20. Upon submittal of a detailed loading plan, the Village reserves the right to restrict or prohibit move-ins/move-outs for the Chestnut building from taking place within the on-street loading space along Chestnut Avenue.
21. Should portions of the property be sold to separate property owners, the property owner shall draft and record provisions for shared parking, shared access, and shared maintenance of common elements and utilities.

Traffic/Street Infrastructure Conditions:

22. Intersection improvements shall be required at the following intersections:
- a. Highland/Campbell: This intersection shall be under 3-way stop sign control. The developer shall install high visibility crosswalks within this intersection. The Village shall relocate the proposed mid-block crosswalk to the eastern leg of this intersection.
 - b. Highland/Sigwalt: This intersection shall be under 4-way stop sign control. The developer shall be responsible for installing high visibility crosswalks within this intersection.
 - c. The developer shall install bump-outs for the on-street parking spaces along the southern side of Campbell Street between Highland and Chestnut. This may include the relocation of an existing fire hydrant. (Additionally, the developer shall be responsible for installing bump outs for the proposed mid-block crosswalk at the eastern leg of the Campbell/Highland intersection.)
 - d. Bump-outs for the on-street parking spaces along the western side of Highland Avenue between Campbell Street and the access drive to the subject property.
23. The developer shall be responsible for the following improvements to Chestnut Avenue:
- e. Chestnut Avenue shall be widened as depicted within the engineering plans. Furthermore, the expansion of Chestnut Avenue and the installation of the parking lane along the eastern side of Chestnut Avenue between Campbell Street and the southern property boundary of the subject property shall be implemented as part of the first phase of development.
 - f. Eight feet of land for public right-of-way shall be dedicated along Chestnut Avenue.
24. The dedication of eight feet of land for public right of way along a portion of Highland Avenue, as shown on the Preliminary Plat of Subdivision, shall be required.
25. If it is determined by the Village that there is unsatisfactory circulation and congestion within and through the subject property, the property owner shall modify the driveway access along Highland Avenue so that it can accommodate two-way travel.
26. The petitioner shall provide visible warning beacons on the garage ramp for the Chestnut building, as well as on the Highland building garage entrances/exits, if determined necessary by the Village.

27. The petitioner shall ensure full streetscape compatibility with the rest of the downtown and shall insure that all disturbed public sidewalks shall be restored in conformance to these standards. Furthermore, prior to building permit issuance, a complete site furnishings package shall be required, for review and approval by the Village.
28. The petitioner shall revise the one-way exit to Chestnut Avenue to bump-out the curb so that the exit tapers down to discourage southbound egress along Chestnut.

General Conditions:

29. At time of building permit, the petitioner shall provide a detailed final construction schedule and logistics plan that identifies staging areas, material storage, lane closures, and construction worker parking for review and approval by the Village. Any work taking place within the right of way shall be scheduled to minimize disruption to other businesses and patrons of the downtown vicinity. Construction traffic shall be limited to pre-approved lanes and locations to be determined by the Village. Emergency access shall be maintained at all times during each phase.
30. The developer shall install and maintain a Village gateway sign (including electric service if so desired by the Village) at the northwest corner of the site. The design and specifications of this sign shall be provided prior to Final Plat of Subdivision approval, and final design and specifications shall be subject to Village review and approval. If it is determined by the Village that the most appropriate location for this sign is within the developers property, the developer shall grant an easement for said sign.
31. Conversion of the Campbell and Highland buildings to condominium units shall require an amendment to the PUD and determination of sufficient parking for such change shall be provided to the satisfaction of the Village.
32. Impact fees shall be required in accordance with the requirements of Chapter 29 of the Municipal Code.
33. The developer shall provide the required number of affordable units in perpetuity as per the recommendation from the Housing Commission, which action must be occur prior to Village Board consideration of this petition.
34. Compliance with March 12th Design Commission motion shall be required.
35. All restaurants shall be required to apply for a Special Use Permit.
36. No medical office uses shall be allowed.
37. The petitioner shall comply with all Federal, State, and Village Codes, Regulations, and Policies.

March 22, 2019

Bill Enright, Deputy Director of Planning and Community Development

Cc: Randy Recklaus, Village Manager
All Department Heads

APPENDIX 1 – Required Variations

1. Variation to Chapter 28, Section 5.1-14.4b, Conditions of Use, to allow dwelling units below the second floor within the Chestnut building.
2. Variation to Chapter 28, Section 5.1-14.2a, Required Minimum Yards, to allow a 7' setback along a public street frontage (Chestnut Avenue) for the Campbell building where code requires a 20' setback
3. Variation to Chapter 28, Section 5.1-14.2a, Required Minimum Yards, to allow a 12.2' setback along a public street frontage (Chestnut Avenue) for the Chestnut building where code requires a 20' setback.
4. Variation to Chapter 28, Section 5.1-14.2b, Required Minimum Yards, to allow a 12.9' setback along an interior lot line (southern lot line) for the Highland building where code requires a 25' setback.
5. Variation to Chapter 28, Section 10.2-7, Size, to allow certain parking spaces within the Highland building garage to be 15.3' in length where code requires 18' in length.
6. Variation to Chapter 28, Section 6.15-2.2, Landscape Requirements between Zoning Districts, to waive the requirement for a 6-foot tall solid screen along the southern property line.
7. Variation to Chapter 29, Section 29-304(l), to allow a 50' wide right-of-way for a local street where code requires a 66' wide right-of-way for local streets, along certain portions of Highland Avenue.

APPENDIX 2 – Height Bonus Analysis

	Highland Building	Campbell Building
A) Setback Bonus. Two additional feet in height shall be allowed for each one foot of building wall setback measured from the property line to building line.		X
B) Landscaped Mall or Plaza Bonus. One additional foot in height shall be allowed for each whole unit of 1,000-square foot of fully landscaped plaza. An area of less than 50 feet in width will be considered setback and not plaza. The Village shall consider appropriate landscaping to include shade trees, shrubs, planter boxes, grass sculpture, decorative paving, fountains, all of which must be for public enjoyment.		
C) Arcade Bonus. Eleven feet six inches additional height shall be allowed for each 1,000-square foot of an arcade. An arcade must have a minimum horizontal clearance of five feet, as measured from the inner wall to the projecting wall, with a minimum height of 9 feet.		
D) Multi-use Concept Bonus. Twenty-three additional feet of height shall be allowed for a building with two different non-residential uses. A use of less than an entire floor area will not qualify for a bonus. Only the following uses will qualify for this height bonus: retail business, services, offices, hotel and theater.		X
E) Enclosed Parking Bonus. Eleven feet six inches additional height shall be allowed for each level of underground car parking. Five feet nine inches additional height shall be allowed for each level of a parking structure above grade.	X	
F) General Amenities Bonus. Twenty-three additional feet in height shall be allowed for landscaping. Landscaping credited under (b) above may not be a part of the general amenities bonus	X	X
G) Upper Floor Setback Bonus. Eleven feet six inches additional height shall be allowed for each whole unit of ten feet setback of the largest floor above the third floor. Setback shall be measured from the face of the lower floor to the face of the largest upper floor.	X	

Appendix 3 – Estimate Fiscal Impact


Real Estate Taxes						
Residential						
Units	Per Unit MV	Market Value	AV	EAV	Tax Rate	RE Taxes
361	120,000	43.3 million	4.3 million	12.1 million	9.5	\$ 1,150,000
						\$ 130,000 (Village Portion)
Commercial						
Square Feet		Tax Per Square foot		RE Taxes		
43,817		\$8-\$10		\$350,536-\$438,170		
				10% (VAH Portion): 35,084-\$43,817		
TOTAL					\$165,084-\$173,817	

Land Dedication (Impact) Fees						
	Units	SD 25	SD 214	AH Parks	Library	Total
Studio	87	\$0	\$0	\$175,705	\$14,113	\$189,818
1br	178	\$1,645	\$689	\$463,371	\$37,220	\$502,925
2br	96	\$36,369	\$15,619	\$259,603	\$20,852	\$332,443
TOTAL	361	\$38,014	\$16,308	\$898,679	\$72,158	\$1,025,186

Spending			
	Population	Per Person Annual	Total
	471	\$11,812*	\$5,279,964

*Per CoStar, figure is per person spending within a 3-mile radius

APPENDIX 4 – Campbell Building Western Setback Variation: Approximate Location of Campbell Building in Relation to Zoning to the West



APPENDIX 5 – Code Required Parking

Building	Commercial Use	Commercial SF (Required Parking)		Studio	1 BR	2BR	Total Units	Required Commercial Parking	Required Residential Parking	Total Required Parking	Spaces per Unit	Spaces per Unit (With Required Commercial Parking Spaces)	Spaces Provided
Highland	Retail	2,869	(2 Spaces)	41	60	24	125	12	131	138	1.5	**1.27	460
	Restaurant (Seating)	1,250	(10 Spaces)										
Campbell	Retail	21,404	(26 Spaces)	42	98	42	182	57	193	253	1.5	**1.27	460
	Restaurant (Seating)	4,787.5	(23 Spaces)										
	Office	7,469	(8 Spaces)										
Campbell & Highland	Retail	24,273	*(35 Spaces)	83	158	66	307	71	324	395	1.5	**1.27	460
	Restaurant (Seating)	6,037.5	*(28 Spaces)										
	Office	7,469	*(8 Spaces)										
Chestnut	-	-	-	4	20	30	54	0	62	62	1.56	1.56	84
*Assesses parking based upon the combined square footages of uses on each floor in the Campbell and Highland buildings, rather than assessing each building individually.													
**Assumes no shared parking between commercial and residential uses. With 69 spaces required for commercial uses, only 391 spaces are available for residents. With 71 spaces required for commercial uses, only 389 spaces are available for residents.													

APPENDIX 6 – Extrapolated Shared Parking Demand Projections

Weekday Projections – 1.5 Spaces per Unit + ITE Projections for Non-Residential Uses

Time	Retail	Restaurant	Office	Residential	Total Required	Surplus/ Deficit	Commercial Total
6:00 AM	0	22	0	461	483	-23	22
7:00 AM	2	37	9	415	463	-3	48
8:00 AM	6	48	13	392	459	1	67
9:00 AM	13	65	15	369	462	-2	93
10:00 AM	22	72	16	346	456	4	110
11:00 AM	30	78	16	323	447	13	124
12:00 PM	33	85	14	300	432	28	132
1:00 PM	32	77	12	323	444	16	121
2:00 PM	31	45	13	323	412	48	89
3:00 PM	29	36	13	323	401	59	78
4:00 PM	26	36	12	346	420	40	74
5:00 PM	20	65	7	392	484	-24	92
6:00 PM	21	71	4	415	511	-51	96
7:00 PM	25	54	0	447	526	-66	79
8:00 PM	23	56	0	452	531	-71	79
9:00 PM	0	54	0	456	510	-50	54
10:00 PM	0	41	0	461	502	-42	41
Method:	ITE/ULI	ITE/ULI	ITE/ULI	1.5 Sp./Unit*	-	-	ITE/ULI
	Total Parking Provided:			460 Spaces			
*1.5 spaces per unit, multiplied by the ULI Recommended Time-of-Day Factors for Weekdays - Residential (Resident) factors 307 Proposed Units (Campbell Building and Highland Building)							

Weekend Projections - 1.5 Spaces per Unit + ITE Projections for Non-Residential Uses

Time	Retail	Restaurant	Office	Residential	Total Required	Surplus/ Deficit	Commercial Total
6:00 AM	0	22	0	461	483	-23	22
7:00 AM	5	32	3	415	455	5	40
8:00 AM	10	55	10	392	467	-7	75
9:00 AM	22	79	13	369	483	-23	114
10:00 AM	28	102	14	346	490	-30	144
11:00 AM	33	108	16	323	480	-20	157
12:00 PM	37	100	14	300	451	9	151
1:00 PM	37	91	13	323	464	-4	141
2:00 PM	36	68	10	323	437	23	114
3:00 PM	34	42	6	323	405	55	82
4:00 PM	28	52	3	346	429	31	83
5:00 PM	25	59	2	392	478	-18	86
6:00 PM	27	68	1	415	511	-51	96
7:00 PM	19	80	0	447	546	-86	99
8:00 PM	19	59	0	452	530	-70	78
9:00 PM	0	42	0	456	498	-38	42
10:00 PM	0	43	0	461	504	-44	43
Method:	ITE/ULI	ITE/ULI	ITE/ULI	1.5 Sp./Unit*	-	-	ITE/ULI
	Total Parking Provided:			460 Spaces			
*1.5 spaces per unit, multiplied by the ULI Recommended Time-of-Day Factors for Weekends - Residential (Resident) factors 307 Proposed Units (Campbell Building and Highland Building)							

Weekday Projections- 1.3 Spaces per Unit + ITE Projections for Non-Residential Uses

Time	Retail	Restaurant	Office	Residential	Total Required	Surplus/ Deficit	Commercial Total
6:00 AM	0	22	0	399	421	39	22
7:00 AM	2	37	9	359	407	53	48
8:00 AM	6	48	13	339	406	54	67
9:00 AM	13	65	15	319	412	48	93
10:00 AM	22	72	16	299	409	51	110
11:00 AM	30	78	16	279	403	57	124
12:00 PM	33	85	14	259	391	69	132
1:00 PM	32	77	12	279	400	60	121
2:00 PM	31	45	13	279	368	92	89
3:00 PM	29	36	13	279	357	103	78
4:00 PM	26	36	12	299	373	87	74
5:00 PM	20	65	7	339	431	29	92
6:00 PM	21	71	4	359	455	5	96
7:00 PM	25	54	0	387	466	-6	79
8:00 PM	23	56	0	391	470	-10	79
9:00 PM	0	54	0	395	449	11	54
10:00 PM	0	41	0	399	440	20	41
Method:	ITE/ULI	ITE/ULI	ITE/ULI	1.3 Sp./Unit*	-	-	ITE/ULI
	Total Parking Provided:			460 Spaces			
*1.3 spaces per unit, multiplied by the ULI Recommended Time-of-Day Factors for Weekdays - Residential (Resident) factors 307 Proposed Units (Campbell Building and Highland Building)							

Weekend Projections - 1.3 Spaces per Unit + ITE Projections for Non-Residential Uses

Time	Retail	Restaurant	Office	Residential	Total Required	Surplus/ Deficit	Commercial Total
6:00 AM	0	22	0	399	421	39	22
7:00 AM	5	32	3	359	399	61	40
8:00 AM	10	55	10	339	414	46	75
9:00 AM	22	79	13	319	433	27	114
10:00 AM	28	102	14	299	443	17	144
11:00 AM	33	108	16	279	436	24	157
12:00 PM	37	100	14	259	410	50	151
1:00 PM	37	91	13	279	420	40	141
2:00 PM	36	68	10	279	393	67	114
3:00 PM	34	42	6	279	361	99	82
4:00 PM	28	52	3	299	382	78	83
5:00 PM	25	59	2	339	425	35	86
6:00 PM	27	68	1	359	455	5	96
7:00 PM	19	80	0	387	486	-26	99
8:00 PM	19	59	0	391	469	-9	78
9:00 PM	0	42	0	395	437	23	42
10:00 PM	0	43	0	399	442	18	43
Method:	ITE/ULI	ITE/ULI	ITE/ULI	1.3 Sp./Unit*	-	-	ITE/ULI
	Total Parking Provided:			460 Spaces			
*1.3 spaces per unit, multiplied by the ULI Recommended Time-of-Day Factors for Weekends - Residential (Resident) factors 307 Proposed Units (Campbell Building and Highland Building)							

APPROVED

PLAN

REPORT OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF A PUBLIC HEARING BEFORE THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS PLAN COMMISSION

COMMISSION

RE: ARLINGTON 425 - HIGHLAND/CAMPBELL/CHESTNUT - PC# 19-001
PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT, PRELIMINARY PLAT OF SUBDIVISION,
REZONING FROM R-3 TO B-5, LAND USE VARIATION TO ALLOW A MULTI-
FAMILY USE WITHIN B-5 DISTRICT, VARIATIONS

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS had before the Village of
Arlington Heights Plan Commission Meeting taken at the Arlington Heights Village
Hall, 33 South Arlington Heights Road, 3rd Floor Board Room, Arlington Heights,
Illinois on the 27th day of March, 2019 at the hour of 7:30 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

TERRY ENNES, Chairman
LYNN JENSEN
MARY JO WARSKOW
JOE LORENZINI
BRUCE GREEN
GEORGE DROST
SUSAN DAWSON
JOHN SIGALOS
JAY CHERWIN

ALSO PRESENT:

SAM HUBBARD, Development Planner
CHARLES WITHERINGTON-PERKINS, Planning & Community Development Director
BILL ENRIGHT, Planning & Community Development Deputy Director

LeGRAND REPORTING & VIDEO SERVICES
Chicago & Roselle, Illinois - Miami & Orlando, Florida
(630) 894-9389 - (800) 219-1212

APPROVED

CHAIRMAN ENNES: This meeting of the Arlington Heights Plan Commission is called to order. Would you please all rise and join us in the pledge of allegiance?

(Pledge of allegiance recited.)

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Thank you. Sam, would you please take the roll?

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Cherwin.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Here.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Dawson.

(No response.)

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Drost.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Here.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Green.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Here.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Jensen.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Here.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Lorenzini.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Here.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Sigalos.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Here.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Warskow.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Here.

MR. HUBBARD: Chairman Ennes.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Here. Was Commissioner Dawson, I thought she was on the schedule to be here?

MR. HUBBARD: She is supposed to attend. She's a little late, but maybe we should get started and she'll come through.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Sam, have all public notices been issued on the petition for this evening?

MR. HUBBARD: They have.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: We have a number of projects that we handled at our last meeting, three to be exact. Is there a motion to approve the minutes from those three projects?

COMMISSIONER GREEN: So moved.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: And a second?

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Second.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: All in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Anybody abstaining or opposed?

COMMISSIONER DROST: I abstain; I was not at the meeting.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: So, our first petition for the evening which I trust all of you are here for, we will get going. This is Petition #19-001, Arlington 425. Is the Petitioner present?

MR. FIRSEL: Yes.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Can I ask you to come forward? Any of the other members of your group that will be testifying this evening, if they could all come together? We'll swear you all in at the same time. This is the Petitioner's group.

APPROVED

Okay, if you would repeat after me? Raise your right hands.
(Witnesses sworn.)

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay, thank you. Now, as you each come up to tell us about the project, if you would each state your name and spell it for our court reporter, that would be appreciated. Also, you're not required to provide us with your address, but if you do, that can give us some additional insight.

So, Petitioner, would you please state your name and tell us about your project?

MR. FIRSEL: Sure. My name is Michael Firsell; I'm the attorney for the Petitioner, with the law firm Firsell Ross. The folks who just stood up here and our owner, Mr. Adreani, have been working on this project for in excess of one year. We, first of all, believe we have put together as a development team what we call the best in class, and hopefully you will agree once you hear the testimony from this group tonight. Every one of them has done work in the Village of Arlington Heights more than once. Our general contractor, Power Construction, who is our contract consultant, John Gorman himself is here this evening to lend any insight as to matters that might come up in his area.

This has truly been a team effort; and when I say a team effort, I mean, the members of the public as far back as last, I believe it was September, we held our first, our meeting open to the public. We had two sessions and there were a significant number of folks who arrived and who reviewed our conceptual plans at that time and gave us many, many suggestions, many of which we took to heart and made changes based on those.

In addition, I cannot begin to express the gratitude I have for the three gentlemen sitting here who have worked tirelessly in just tremendous assistance in helping us move this matter forward, cutting to the chase on this very, very ambitious large project, have handled it as true professionals as they always have. Charles and I go back 26 years I think. So, we do appreciate their input.

As you may be aware, we have already been before the Design Commission, and we had three meetings with the Design Commission. They, at the first two meetings, gave us various suggestions as to how to improve the architecture, and we took virtually all of their suggestions and incorporated those suggestions into our plans.

We are here before you tonight with what we believe is simply an outstanding project and what I would dub the crown jewel of Downtown Arlington Heights. Hopefully, you will feel the same way.

Very, very quickly, this project is on Block 425, it's the north three-quarters of that block bounded by Sigwalt, Highland, Campbell and Chestnut. Campbell building, there are three buildings, Campbell building is nine stories with first two floors. First floor will be a restaurant, maybe a two-story restaurant/retail uses, and the second floor will be more for more commercial uses, maybe office space, et cetera. That building will contain 182 residential units; 42 studios, 98 one-bedroom, and 42 two-bedroom apartments.

The Highland building is a taller building. This building presented significant challenges as it is right up against the Vail Street Garage which comes in fact to the property line. It was very difficult to figure out what to do with the portion of the property that abutted the Vail Street Garage, and since this is under your zoning a B-5 project and we are looking to have a one-lot PUD with underlying zoning of B-5, we know that we would need significant parking. So, therefore, we are proposing a six-level parking deck for this project.

APPROVED

Above the parking deck will be 125 apartments on six floors, and on top of the building with probably the best view in town will be the amenity center including health club, meeting rooms, and hopefully a full-service restaurant. Views would be great up there.

The Chestnut building was originally a five-story building, and the Campbell building was originally an eight-story building. The downtown plan calls for six to eight stories, and we tried to keep two of the buildings within that limitation. We couldn't possibly keep the Highland building within that limitation because the garage is already five stories; we'd have to build above that. But in considering the neighborhood and prior hearings of which I was a part and the desire to have more residential-friendly user facing Chestnut Street, we lowered that building from 5.5, in some places six stories, to four stories. When I say lowered, when we were here at early review with the Village Board, we had proposed a six-story building, and now it is four stories and really truly looks like row homes.

I mentioned that we're looking for an underlying zoning of B-5. Four of these lots to the south are residential, three of them about the Vail Street Garage, one of them is on Chestnut, the southernmost lot. So, we are looking to rezone those four lots along with the remaining 13 lots which are already B-5 to make one B-5 zoning lot.

We are requesting very few variances in this case, seven to be exact. Three of them deal with setbacks, a couple caused by the required eight-foot dedication of land along Chestnut and a portion of Highland. One of the variances that is required is that we have a 66-foot wide street. Well, we certainly can't do that under the Vail Street Garage, so it is what it is and we don't have much choice. One of the other variances of course is to not require commercial/retail/restaurant uses on the first floor of the Chestnut building directly across from single-family residences.

In B-5, multifamily buildings are not allowed, so we would need a variation to allow us to put residences on the first floor of that building. We have 10 parking spaces in the garage which are 15 feet long instead of 18, and we can easily put motorcycles as well as compact cars in those spots or we would have to eliminate them, which we would prefer not to do. So, the other variances deal with the, like I said, the setbacks and the like.

The most important part of what we had originally presented and continue to present is that we are not asking for any variances in what I consider three of the most sensitive areas. We are not asking for a variance as to density. The number of units proposed falls well within the existing Village code. We are not asking for a variance as to height. Even with the taller building, with the bonuses that you saw we were allowed in your report, we will not need a variance as to height. Certainly, we will not need a variance as to parking as we are providing 89 more parking spaces for this project than code requires, at a cost of about \$2.7 million I might add.

So, needless to say, as a first class luxury building, it will be landscaped. We have submitted landscape plans. We're not going to go through them in detail this evening, but certainly Becky Mathis from Hitchcock Design is here if there are any questions regarding that.

With that, I would like to proceed and call upon Rob Losselyoung and Kelle Bruckbauer from Tinaglia Architects, Incorporated, and ask them to spend just a couple of minutes going through the overall site plan itself. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Mr. Firsell, before they come up, I have a question for you.

APPROVED

MR. FIRSEL: Sure.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: You're aware of the conditions that Staff has placed on the project?

MR. FIRSEL: Yes, we have read the conditions.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay, there's a number of them.

MR. FIRSEL: Yes, there are.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Are you agreeable to the conditions?

MR. FIRSEL: Most of them, but not all.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Can you tell us which ones you are not, you do not agree with?

MR. FIRSEL: At this point?

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Yes.

MR. FIRSEL: Sure. May I grab my notes? I didn't know that question was going to be asked at this point.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Absolutely.

MR. FIRSEL: Okay, I'll do it from, who has the Staff report?

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Do we have an extra copy of this so that we follow along in the same order?

MR. FIRSEL: Or if you'd put it on the screen, we can follow along.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Just so we're aware of these as they go along.

MR. FIRSEL: Yes, I'm ready to go.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Go for it.

MR. FIRSEL: Certainly we agree and request all of the variances and its conditions, no problem. Condition number one under Fire Safety, we thought we had covered this very well in our responses, but apparently it didn't get across. If we went and we build the area between the two buildings, we call it the courtyard, it's going to be built once and stay there. So, Fire Safety does not want us to build a temporary roadway and then build the Highland building because you can't get to it to put a fire out. So, once we build that courtyard, it is permanent and will not be removed.

So, we agree with condition number one. Condition number two, so both conditions under Fire Safety. Condition three we agree with. Condition four we agree with, and five, okay.

Condition six we do agree with. We would like to change one word in that. Let's see, maybe they already changed it. The ability to require certain upgrades to the garage as it determines necessary to facilitate, the costs of any required modifications shall be borne by the developer, that is agreeable. In fact, we have spent considerable time, effort and energy, and we have already designed what we feel will be adequate. One thing that we do want to point out is that when we do build the Highland side of the garage that abuts the Vail Street Garage, we will have to access the Vail Street Garage to adjoin the two. They're not going to be the same but we don't want any spacing between them, so we're going, you'll see that we will be proposing a filler so that there is not a gap of however many feet or inches there would be so we wouldn't need temporary access to make sure --

CHAIRMAN ENNES: There won't be any cross access?

MR. FIRSEL: No. No, it's a completely separate structure. No party wall or anything like that.

APPROVED

CHAIRMAN ENNES: So, that change has been made in six?

MR. FIRSEL: Yes. The Site Conditions seven, that's fine. Eight, that is fine. Nine is fine. Let me explain that on number nine. I am lucky enough to come back again and represent the party who is under contract by the property to the south. So, what my client here wants to do is meet with that client of mine and to coordinate a transition between the two parcels so the block looks like a cohesive block. So, we may come back jointly and suggest transitional barriers between the two parcels.

I think there was something about a black iron rail somewhere in here. Black iron rails aren't used; they're aluminum today, so it wouldn't be iron. You can't even get them today.

So, the other items we agree with in Site Conditions. So far so good, okay.

The detailed parking which is an issue, you will hear this evening as much of a detailed parking plan as we can provide at this time. We cannot agree on a few items in here such as what the fee will be at this time and what we're going to charge. This is a private garage, this isn't a public garage. This is primarily for our tenants and our customers. One of the differences is that we cannot and will not make our garage open to the public, period.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Other than to customers within your development.

MR. FIRSEL: Well, of course. The general public would not have the ability to park in our garage. They would have the ability to enter, they would take a ticket if they chose to, and I shouldn't say we will not allow them, we will not allow them to park for free. If they happen to come in and pull a ticket and they pay for their parking, they'd be able to park there, okay. But it is not open to the public as a general rule because we want to make sure our customers, our retailers, our office people and employees and valets have room for the cars that we have from this project. So, we need to fine tune that, but after Deb Smart testifies as to 14-A, we will be able to hopefully discuss that later this evening.

Since we had not seen round three comments until yesterday, I can't, I will look at them this evening, but I don't think we're going to have any problem with, I didn't see any problems in those comments that would be problematic for us. C will be presented this evening in great detail which is how the loading, unloading and the like work. D is a no, we will not agree to remove or relocate the loading docks on Highland. Okay?

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay.

MR. FIRSEL: We can go to specific reasons later, but I want to keep it brief.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Sure.

MR. FIRSEL: So you know which ones we agree to and which ones we don't or need to discuss, okay?

And 15 I've already addressed, so the answer to that is, as a general rule, no, but it's going to be impossible to keep the public out because the garage wouldn't know where they are going. So, they can get in, but if they go out they're going to pay a fee, and it will likely be higher than a fee they would pay in a Village garage because we don't want them to park there, to be quite honest with you.

The parking signage plan is not a problem. 16 is fine. Of course, 17 I just said is not okay and we cannot agree to that, okay.

We cannot agree to 18. This is absolutely impossible to do from our

APPROVED

standpoint. This is a private garage, it is a private building. This is, we are not being subsidized to build this garage and make it open to the public. So, therefore, if we want to assign parking space to a tenant who has a space a whopping amount of rent, we should have the right to assign our parking spaces to whomever we like. However, we will agree that any assigned parking spaces for residents will be on the levels reserved only for residents. We will not assign parking spaces to residents, as you will hear, on the first two levels of the garage because the residents aren't going to be parking on the first two levels. They're going to take the higher levels of parking.

The same thing with rent. If we want to include a parking space within a party's rent, we should have the right to do that. So, if they pay \$100 a month for parking and they say just add it on to my lease and I'll increase my lease by \$100, we should have the right to do that.

The loading operations we will discuss in greater detail. Deb Smart from Briarwood Management who manages three buildings in town, a well-known, well-liked personality here, lives directly across the street from this project, will be discussing how the inside of this project will work and how their loading, unloading, timing garbage and everything will be handled. You will hear from here a little later, okay.

Number 20 we cannot agree with because we don't know how people will get into and out of the Chestnut building. We will work with Staff on that issue to try to make it at a time that is least traveled. But we are in fact widening Chestnut from what it is today by eight feet or nine feet to provide additional parking, because today you can't go down Chestnut both ways with a car parked. It's not wide enough. So, we are bringing back parking and we are creating parking spaces, and I assume that you would request the party to the south to do the same. In front of the Highland building is a proposed loading zone, off the middle of the street where cars will still be able to get by in both directions.

We did have a loading zone on the south end of that building, but due to the fact that the Fire Department required a clear 26-foot driving lane, we were forced to remove that. So, the only other thing is to pull into a loading dock in a different building, walk all the way across the street under the existing garage, up to the elevator, and then across to the Chestnut building. It would be very, very expensive for the tenants moving in, and quite time-consuming. You'll see a little more about that as we go on, okay.

21 we absolutely agree with, that's not a problem. I believe Mr. Aboona who will be speaking next can talk to most of these items, but we have no problem with A, B, C, D. The Chestnut Avenue improvements, like I said, we will pay for the widening and the expansion of Chestnut parking lane across the east, and so 23 is not a problem. A and B, we agree to those. 24 is agreed. 25 is agreed.

26, that's the law, so certainly we agree to number 26. 27 is agreed. 28 is agreed. I missed one, my apologies. We cannot do the 23-A. I should have put my glasses on.

The southern property boundary shall be implemented as part of the first phase of the development, we cannot do that. The east side of Chestnut, that's the building, the Chestnut building is going to be the second phase. That's the last building built. So, trucks will be coming in and out. To make us build that whole side of the street, it's going to get destroyed. It's going to get absolutely destroyed because that's where we're going to be building this four-story Chestnut Street building. To make us build that street as part of the first phase

APPROVED

and then rebuild it when it gets destroyed as part of the second phase doesn't make sense to us. So, we cannot agree to do that.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: But you can do it as part of phase two?

MR. FIRSEL: Well, of course.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: So, you'll leave the setback on the, or there'll be the space on the Campbell Street building?

MR. FIRSEL: 23-A as part of the second phase of development instead of the first is absolutely agreeable. Of course we will do that, not a question.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: So, 23-A is okay in phase two.

MR. FIRSEL: Subject to that one change, yes, in phase two, yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, in phase two, okay?

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay.

MR. FIRSEL: Sorry, I'm going a little fast. On the issue of making the Highland one-way in, if you want to make it, if the Staff or the Village says it should be two-way, that should be a joint decision between us and the Village, not the sole decision of the Village. Certainly, if there is a problem, a logjam, it would cost us tenants. Monetarily, it's not an issue, but the question is do we need it? Because we've had opposition to making that two-way, and before we change our entire plan, we would want to participate in those discussions and have a say in that decision. Okay, what section is that, Luay? Section 25.

So, what we would want that to say, if it is determined by the Village and consented to by the developer, we would agree to make that two-way, or the owner.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay.

MR. FIRSEL: I believe we said 29 would be okay. The gateway sign, if the Village wants a gateway sign, we're not sure why we would pay for that gateway sign and have it lit. So, we'll install it, we'll provide it, but I'm not sure we would pay for it. Now, if we want to put a cost limitation of a reasonable number on that, you know, not to exceed, then of course that's an entirely different story. We have no idea what Staff or anybody else has in mind for such a sign, but we can't open a checkbook to a sign that has no cost limitation.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: I don't read 30 as saying that you will provide it. It says you shall install and maintain.

MR. FIRSEL: Okay, that's fine. So, all we would need to do is simply clarify that. Okay?

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay, we'll cover that in the Staff report.

MR. FIRSEL: Yes, we'll install and we'll maintain it, not a problem. Who pays for it is a shared cost; we'd be fine with that, okay?

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay.

MR. FIRSEL: With 31 we agree. 32 we agree. With 33, let me discuss affordable units for a moment. The required number, we will agree to provide that number which is approved by the Housing Commission and Village Board. Whatever number they say we're going to do. We have been negotiating this issue with Staff. We've had several meetings on it. We intend to appear at the Housing Commission as soon as possible. There will be in fact real units, not payment in lieu units, maybe a few, but we are going to provide affordable housing units for people to live in. But that will be discussed, voted on, and recommended at the Housing Commission.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: That will make a lot of people happy.

APPROVED

MR. FIRSEL: I hope so. 34 of course, 35 is fine. 36, we would like to modify that. No medical office will be allowed on the first floor of any of the buildings. If we have a dentist that wants to have an office, or we have, you know, we don't see a big Illinois bone and joint medical clinic here, but you know, we may have a local eye doctor, dentist, or someone else who might want to have an office on the second floor, and we would like the ability to do that. We can certainly put a limitation on how many square feet of office we could have since they don't produce sales tax. We want to leave the first floor available for sales taxpaying customers, as I'm sure you want us to, but we would like the ability of some portion of the second floor available, especially on the west side of the Campbell building, for possible medical office.

And 37 is an absolute no. I am just being facetious and we will comply with each and every law.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: You might get a lot of people to agree with that.

MR. FIRSEL: Does that answer your question so far?

CHAIRMAN ENNES: It does.

MR. FIRSEL: It details where we are.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: That was lengthy and I apologize, but it's really important for us to know that going into the questions and whatnot and how we direct that.

MR. FIRSEL: Okay, thank you so much, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Thank you, and if you'd like to bring your architects up?

MR. FIRSEL: Mr. Aboona. Oh, I apologize, Mr. Losselyoung and Ms. Bruckbauer who will discuss the overall site plan.

MR. LOSSELYOUNG: Thank you. I think I need a pointer. Good evening, I'm Rob Losselyoung, project manager with Tinaglia Architects. Last name is L-o-s-s-e-l-y-o-u-n-g.

MS. BRUCKBAUER: And I'm Kelle Bruckbauer with Tinaglia Architects, B-r-u-c-k-b-a-u-e-r.

MR. LOSSELYOUNG: Thank you for allowing us to be here this evening. We're very excited to be part of Bruce's team on this project. We've been working with Bruce for over two years now, and this project has come a long way, not only with just working with Bruce and his people, but also with presentations we've done with the neighborhood last September, with Village Staff, several meetings we've had and worked with them. It's been a fantastic, you know, trip through all of this with the, you know, preliminary Village Board, gave us some great feedback, Design Commission, and then the Plat and Sub comments as well. We think that the project has developed quite a bit and we feel we've been pretty open to a lot of suggestions, and we hope that those changes are relevant in what we're going to show you here.

We're going to just keep it really quick, just talking about the site itself. As Mike had mentioned, on the east side of the property, we have the existing Vail Street Garage that comes across right up to the property line. Having that there, Sam's doing it, too, the existing five-story structure or the parking garage here, we needed to figure out what we could put there. We felt putting our parking for both the Highland building and the Campbell building would be best situated in that area abutting the existing Village garage. The residents that will be in the Campbell building will access the garage via an underground tunnel that goes across this access point here, and that will go up to elevators that take them into the parking garage here, as well as then once they're in the building, elevators that take them up into their

APPROVED

residences.

Going back, one of the other things is, the Chestnut building being located here across the street is existing single-family residences, so we wanted to be very mindful of that with this building. As Mike had mentioned initially, we were proposing a 5.5 story building there. Based on comments, we decided to reduce that to a four-story building. That building is here, the Chestnut building. What we tried to do with this is make it look like an old brownstone type streetscape with first floor entry balconies at several locations, a center entry here, and then our access drive to just this building will be down here on the south side of the Chestnut building.

Lastly is the Campbell building which is both of these boxes that you see here. What we have a porte cochere, a two-story porte cochere that goes underneath this building that allows access to our center court here. Initially, when we first came to the preliminary hearing in front of the Village Board, our main access point was here off of Highland. Based on a lot of feedback we got from the Village Board as well as from residents, we looked at it and we felt that making this our main entry point into our site helped lose some of that congestion that we heard a lot of comments about in this area. So, going forward, here is the backside of that porte cochere here into our center motor court, and then here is that entry point here with the center motor court coming in off of Campbell. Then as you come around here, you can also see this is the existing Village garage here, and then our new garage structure abuts right here with the remaining six stories of the Highland building up here, and then the amenity floor that Mike Firsel also mentioned up there.

So, going back, so this is the most traditional of our three buildings. One of the things we tried to do is create what we like to call a sisterhood of buildings, having some similar materials, some similar elements that go from each building. But this is the most traditional building, it will be the, you know, most highly detailed. This one is more familiar as part of the Campbell Street Corridor. You know, we've got eight-story buildings on both sides of this that are similar and familiar in detail. Then this is what we like to consider the exciting, new loft style building with our new parking garage here, and then six stories of residential units above across the whole building, and then the amenity floor on the top.

We are proposing these glass curtain walls on the ends, the shoulders, and the idea behind that was twofold. One, just a new interesting element in the Downtown Arlington Heights, but also because of the side of the building, trying to lighten the ends of the building so it didn't seem like a long heavy building, trying to create character at either end. Again, this will be, you know, the thought is that this will be for the younger people getting on the train, traveling downtown, loft style units. This will be a little more highly detailed units inside, and then these will be more traditional, almost condo-like finishes within the Chestnut building.

Lastly, we do have a courtyard then, and I apologize here, we may not be able to see it. So, between the Chestnut building which is here, so each of the, all right, let me go back, each of the buildings has a rooftop terrace or area. So, like the Campbell building will have dining units, they'll have barbecue stations up here, little fire pits, gas fire pits. This is the Chestnut building; it will have green areas as well as areas up there, and then on either end of the Highland will have terraces as well.

Between the Chestnut building and the Highland building, we have a courtyard. Initially, we had hoped to have that whole courtyard be able to be landscaped. But

APPROVED

working with Staff and hearing comments, we now have to make that into a fire lane. We're still working with Staff to determine how far that fire lane has to go between the two buildings, so that maybe at the end here we could still provide a fire pit or a pergola or a sitting area of some sort down at the end. So, we're still trying to work with Staff on that.

Because of the existing Village parking garage being here, you know, we had to find a way to get our main entrance into the Highland building. So, that is, oh, I guess that slide is not on here; I apologize. So, the main entrance into the Highland building is right here off of the motor court. So, not only do the cars come in here to the parking garage, but then our main entry is here as well, and we can go back to the site plan.

So, here is where all the cars can enter for the commercial space, the retail space in here, and then this is the main entry into the Highland building. This is that tunnel I spoke of that will be underground right here, connecting the Highland building to the Campbell building. Then this entrance here will be for the tenants of the Highland building as well as the Campbell building. Only the tenants will be allowed to come in and out of that access.

With that, we'll turn it over to Luay Aboona from KLOA.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Thank you.

MR. ABOONA: Good evening. My name is Luay Aboona, A-b-o-o-n-a, traffic engineer and principal with the firm KLOA, located in Rosemont.

I'll speak briefly with regards to the traffic and parking study that we completed. We worked very closely with the Village Staff, both the Planning Department and Engineering Department, in finalizing the study to the point where we believe it was accepted in terms of the recommendations to address the traffic and parking impacts of the proposed development.

So, I'll just go through a few slides that hopefully will summarize some of our findings. The site is located on the west portion of the Village of Arlington Heights Downtown District. The downtown obviously offers a mix of retail, entertainment and commercial uses. It has high pedestrian mobility and interactivity between all these different uses, and offers convenient access to public transportation for daily commute with regards to the Metra Station as well as the Pace Bus on Northwest Highway. It also provides convenient access to goods and services.

All of that will translate, or will qualify this development as a transit-oriented development which would help reduce the traffic and trip generation of the development as well as its parking needs. Also, this development itself with these residents will offer a complementary land use to further support the businesses within the Downtown District, so it definitely offers a very good synergy and interactivity between the different uses.

The roadway system generally within downtown provide one way of one travel lane in each direction. Almost all the intersection are under stop sign control. A number of the intersections within the downtown, Campbell and Vail, and Campbell and Dunton and Sigwalt, and Vail and Sigwalt and Dunton are under all-way stop sign control. The rest, the north-south approaches are under the stop sign control, and Campbell and Sigwalt and free flow.

The speed limit is posted as 25 miles an hour, and the on-street parking is generally available with and without restriction. The restriction is normally two-hour parking. Without the restriction, obviously you can park unlimited.

APPROVED

The pedestrian mobility in the area is enhanced because of the availability of crosswalks, sidewalks. You know, there is a mid-block crosswalk being planned on Campbell, east of Highland, which you'll see later on in the presentation. Also, as part of the Staff recommendation, it would be relocated to the intersection of Campbell and Highland. There are bicycle racks provided within downtown, as well as the Metra Station which is about 1,000 feet walking distance from the site, as well as the Pace bus route. So, again, downtown offers a very good mobility and alternative modes of transportation for the future residents of the development.

So, you saw the site plan Rob presented. What I'm going to do is talk about the access externally, and then also internally. So, what we are proposing is off Campbell Street an entrance to the porte cochere that will provide drop-off lanes for the Campbell buildings on either side. This will provide full access, meaning cars can turn from the east and west and then exit both left and right. The traffic exiting will be under stop sign control. We're providing access off Highland. This will be limited to an inbound-only access, so it would serve traffic coming mainly from the east on Campbell and some traffic that is coming from the east or west on Sigwalt.

We're also providing a garage access at this location here. This would be for residents only of the Campbell building garage, so there will be a fob that would be operated by the residents only. None of the commercial traffic will be able to use it. They will instead come in here internally through the courtyard.

On Chestnut, we'll have an exit only, and this will be restricted to right-out only on the stop sign control. The intent of this again is to provide additional access out of the development, but also to limit the impact on Chestnut Avenue so none of the traffic will be able to travel south. Staff had the recommendation of some additional channelization and a bump-out at that location to make the restriction more enforceable, and we're agreeable to doing so. Then the Chestnut building with its parking garage will have its own access off Chestnut Avenue. This would be strictly for the 84 parking spaces that serve the Chestnut building.

So, these are the external points of ingress and egress. We believe that with this design, it will help distribute the traffic in and out of the development and lessen the impact of the traffic on the area roadways or intersections. We see that this entrance and exit serving the residential portion of the garage, that will see most of the traffic from a residential standpoint, particularly for people or residents that are destined to Sigwalt all the way to Arlington Heights Road which has a signalized intersection. So, this garage entrance and exit we believe will see the majority of the residential traffic from the garage using it.

Internally, we are also providing a number of loading zones, passenger loading zones as I indicated earlier along the porte cochere off Campbell. There will be a loading zone on either side for both sections of the Campbell building. There's going to be a loading zone here for the Highland building so cars coming in can utilize this and then exit or enter the garage.

This is the garage entrance internal to the development of the courtyard. This garage entrance could be used by the residents, but it also will be the entrance for the commercial uses of the development, for the office and retail and restaurant uses. They will be restricted to using this entrance, whereas the residents can use this one as well as the Highland Avenue garage.

Then the Chestnut building will also have a loading zone at this

APPROVED

location here that would allow for both passenger loading as well as deliveries to occur here at the added width of Chestnut Avenue. So, that will not be obstructing the through-traffic on Chestnut.

Truck loading, we're providing six loading zones or loading berths. Four of the six will be internal to the site, so we're moving, we're putting in as many of those loading berths internal to the site, again to minimize the impact on the street system. So, these are highlighted in yellow, you know, two on this side, one on this side, and one here, and then two on Highland Avenue that will serve the Highland building. Deb Smart will get into a little bit more detail in terms of the management and the operations of those loading docks.

The Chestnut Avenue improvement, which has been touched upon as far as the Staff comments, will entail, will include widening the street eight feet in order to provide the additional width. Currently, the street is narrow, and while there is parking on one side, it makes it very difficult for two cars to pass each other. So, what we're doing as part of this development is widening Chestnut on the east side eight feet in order to create 10 parking spaces as well as the loading zone, as you can see in front of the lobby of the building. On this diagram, you also see the right-out coming out of the courtyard onto Chestnut Avenue, the exit only, and then the garage access in and out to the Chestnut building.

So, what we did as part of the traffic study is we looked at the traffic conditions in the downtown area. We looked at 12 intersections to see what the traffic level, traffic volume level at these intersections are during the peak commuter hours, morning and evening. We took into account the pedestrian activity at all of these intersections, and we overlaid on top of it the traffic from the proposed development. We analyzed both the existing traffic volumes as well as the future traffic volumes under the 2024 conditions, so we carried this five years into the future and added some additional growth and background traffic in order to anticipate what the future traffic conditions would be at those intersections.

We also factored into the analysis the pedestrians. As I said, we did take counts at those intersections to understand what the existing pedestrian activities are. But we also increased those to account for the increased pedestrian activity resulting from the proposed development. So, we tried to capture as much of the future conditions as possible to get a snapshot of how intersections are going to operate and what kind of improvements or changes need to be made.

So, some of these findings, I think one of the key based on what I indicated earlier, given the location of this development in a downtown setting and an urban environment close to different alternative transportation, namely, the Metra Station, we expect that some of that traffic will be reduced because of that. This, you know, reduction, based at least historically on what the existing developments in downtown are experiencing, could be 15 to 20 percent. So, we anticipate that many residents in the morning and evening rush hour will walk to the train station instead of driving, which will help bring down some of the traffic and reduce that impact.

So, given that, you know, we found that the development-generated traffic can be accommodated without significant impact to the external roadway system. We found that the intersections will generally continue to operate at the comparable level of service and delay as they do today. We didn't see anything that was significant that caused us concern. But we have made a couple of recommendations that I will get into to help mitigate some of those impacts.

APPROVED

One of them is to install or modify the intersection of Highland, or Campbell from a one-way stop controlled intersection. Right now, only the Highland Avenue traffic going northbound stops, and Campbell traffic does not stop. There are some sight line issues at that intersection relative to the building in the southeast corner and the northeast corner as well as the parking along Campbell, which makes it a little difficult for cars exiting being able to see what's coming at them from Campbell. So, in discussions with the Staff, we agreed that this location would be a good candidate for an all-way stop controlled intersection. So, now we're going to install stop signs so traffic on Campbell will stop. It will be very similar to what you see at Vail and Dunton to the east, so it would become an all-way stop controlled intersection.

Same thing with Sigwalt, while the sight lines are clear there, there are a couple of concerns with the pedestrians crossing at that intersection. Since there are crosswalks striped on all four legs, traffic on Sigwalt doesn't stop and, you know, it becomes a little unsafe for pedestrians to cross that intersection under uncontrolled conditions. Then given that we expect a lot of our residential traffic coming out of the garage off Highland will be traveling through that intersection, again we felt in discussion with Staff that that would be a good candidate for modification to an all-way stop controlled intersection.

So, that's our recommendation is to change those two intersections to all-way stop. We analyzed them under that condition, and we found them to operate better than if we leave them as they are today, both from an operation and capacity standpoint as well as from a safety standpoint as I indicated with sight lines and pedestrian activity.

The other two intersections at Chestnut and Campbell, and Chestnut and Sigwalt, they are under two-way stop control, meaning Campbell and Sigwalt traffic does not stop. That doesn't need to be changed. Those will continue to operate adequately there. We didn't see any issues with capacity or sight lines that warrant changes to these two intersections.

As far as access is concerned, again the access off Campbell, you know, will be full, allowing full movements with one inbound lane, one outbound lane, with the outbound movements under stop sign control. We don't see the need for any widening or any adjustments to Campbell Street in terms of accommodating the turning movements from Campbell. This intersection will not conflict with the access drives on the north side of Campbell. The garage access to the condominium building to the east is located far enough where it's not going to create any conflicts.

You know, we did a sight distance evaluation as requested by Staff, and in order to meet the sight line triangles, most of the parking along Campbell will have to be removed. But we are continuing these discussions with Staff to see if that's going to be necessary or not, particularly with the conversion of Campbell and Highland to all-way stop sign control. The access drives at Chestnut, again given that one of the access drives will be a one-way right-out and the other one will be restricted to the Chestnut garage, the impact on Chestnut will be low and will not be significant, particularly given the fact that we will be widening Chestnut to make the traffic flow better along that section of the block.

The garage access on Highland, this is the one which would be restricted to residents only, will allow full access. Again, while it's going to serve the residents, it's still going to have a low impact on the traffic operations on Highland as well as on the ramp operations. We are lining it up opposite the southerly access to the Vail Avenue Garage, so we're creating an alignment to make sure that as cars are coming out of our garage as well as the Vail Avenue Garage, they can see each other and not going to create any conflicts. The

APPROVED

outbound movements will be under stop sign control, and we will be installing warning devices at the garage access drives to warn pedestrians of exiting traffic.

Pedestrian movements, you know, there are high visibility crosswalks provided at intersections surrounding the site. We will do the same across the driveway's approach of each of the proposed access drive. Now, we are recommending that the standard crosswalks on the east and south legs of Chestnut and Wing Street be re-stripped as high visibility to improve the pedestrian safety. Same thing at the north and south legs of Chestnut at Sigwalt. None exist today, so we believe those should be added where, you know, Chestnut is under stop sign control. As indicated earlier, the Village has done a study to identify the need for a mid-block crosswalk on Campbell between Highland and Vail. Based on the recommendation of modifying Campbell and Vail to an all-way stop controlled intersection, the Village has recommended now that that crosswalk be relocated to the east leg of the intersection and will be installed there with bump-outs which would provide a better location for that intersection with the change of the traffic control.

Parking, you heard the number of parking spaces being provided, a total of 544 spaces; 460 spaces will be provided in the Highland garage and 84 in the Chestnut garage. We believe that this parking is adequate based on industry standards and requirements of a typical TOD development as we have experienced at other locations in the region. We did conduct a shared parking analysis as the Village requested which looked at both the residential and non-residential uses within the development. We used the modified Village code requirement for the residential as well as ITE standards, so we did multiple runs of different scenarios. When we used either the Village code throughout or the ITE standard throughout, what we found is that there will be adequate parking to accommodate the different uses since they have different peaking characteristics throughout the day. So, it works really well from a shared parking concept which helps lower the number of parking spaces and make better use of those parking spaces which otherwise would sit vacant during the day when the residents are at work, and at night when the office and retail restaurant uses are not busy.

So, in conclusion, the development, you know, being a TOD, being located in the downtown district near public transportation, it's considered a TOD. As a result, the development-generated traffic would be reduced due the availability of the alternative modes of transportation, and the convenience and accessibility of goods and services without residents having to drive to get to those. The analysis showed that the development traffic will have a low impact on the surrounding roadway traffic and pedestrian operations. Proposed access has been designed very carefully to ensure that the traffic is efficiently distributed in order to minimize its impact on area roadways and intersections. Chestnut Avenue widening will definitely improve the traffic operations along that section of the road, and pedestrian crosswalk improvements will further enhance the pedestrian mobility in the downtown area. Finally, the proposed parking supply will be adequate to accommodate the parking needs of the development.

With that, I conclude and I will turn it over to Deb Smart. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Thank you. Good evening.

MS. SMART: Good evening, everyone. Debbie Smart, S-m-a-r-t. I am the manager of Resident Services for Briarwood Management. We manage several properties here in town. I also live at 200 West Campbell, sixth floor. My balcony will be looking at this project, FYI.

Good evening, Commissioners, Staff, neighbors, most of them are

APPROVED

here. I'm here representing Briarwood Management tonight to discuss some of the uniqueness of this property, some of the challenges of this property, and some of the unique steps that have been taken by this particular planning team to combat those. It is rare that a management company is involved in this part of the project. It's pretty much unheard of.

So, the fact that when we started to receive comments from Staff, various agencies here in the government, and our neighbors, this management team here, the planning team, went out and secured us as a consultant on the project. The reason they did that is because they had a duty, they felt, and a commitment to be a good neighbor, and that's what they've done tonight. So, we're going to go through a lot of the operational aspects of the buildings. These are rarely discussed at this level, but because of the density of the project, I do believe they're necessary.

So, moving on to kind of the staffing of the building, most of the buildings in Downtown Arlington Heights have part-time management and staff on board. It's either a part-time cleaning person/building engineer, and probably a management representative who is not on site. This building will have, this program and project will have five full-time employees on site; that will include a full-time on-site property manager, two full-time engineers, two full-time maintenance personnel. This isn't even talking about the garage. That level of commitment is extraordinary, and this team here is to be commended for making that level of commitment up front. The reason that's important is because this is a big project.

This is not going to be a transient project. This is going to be long-term luxury rentals. There will be a minimum of a one-year lease on all leases in the building. There will be extremely well thought out and conceived rules and regulations which will be developed comparable to surrounding buildings. They will include a code of conduct, they will include a pet policy, and they will include a vehicle registration policy, which in light of the recent news I think Staff might like. So, that will be adhered to 100 percent of the time.

All move-in and move-outs will require advanced scheduling within the hours of 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, Saturdays 8:00 a.m. to 1:00. Sunday moves are not on the board at this point in time, and all moves will be supervised by a staff member. That rarely happens in many of the buildings downtown, but it's important because we need to make sure we have adherence and we have people being responsible for moving in and moving out in a nondestructive manner.

We also will have dedicated bike storage in each of the buildings, and we will be promoting bike usage within the Village. I believe one of the amenities we're even talking about is a bike club, so I think that would be great. We will have detailed floor recycling staging areas where we're encouraging recycling. We will have all delivery by vendors going through a complete building orientation prior to the opening of the building so they understand the rules of the road. That's really important because this building is one of the few buildings in Arlington Heights that will have total off-street delivery options.

One of the major complaints from our neighbors is the clogging of Downtown Arlington Heights with delivery trucks, food trucks, beer trucks, FedEx, UPS. This building, after those comments, went back and the project decided to provide 100 percent off-street delivery options, and those are all those loading zones that you saw just recently. That is a huge commitment by a project.

We also will be having all of our vehicles in complete compliance with licensing, insurance, and permitting. Residents will be required to provide proof of renter's

APPROVED

insurance when they move in, and they will be audited on an annual basis to ensure they're in effect. Pets will require a yearly fee, proof of rabies vaccination, and Village tags. We also on our site will be providing a pet/dog walk area, so we will have an area for the dogs to exercise and do their business. Building staff will be ensuring full-time compliance.

Now, to the thin part of the presentation. The parking is going to be designated. The top three floors of the Highland garage will be reserved and accessible to residents of the buildings. That's the 325 spaces we've been talking about. If we find that the usage dictates that more or less spaces are needed for residents, such number will be allocated.

Current trends that we are seeing from Briarwood and the Village of Arlington Heights is we are actually seeing less car use at this point in time. We have several projects right now where we actually do currently purchase parking passes on a monthly basis from the Village, and we are seeing a decline in the request for those passes. The younger generation is definitely using mass transit, Uber-ing and such, and cars are not in the scheme of things for them these days.

The remaining 135 spaces on the first and second floor will be available to all guests, employees, office tenants, valet parking, via a ticketed entry and exit system. Validation of tickets will be given upon entry and must be validated by retailers, residents, employers, et cetera for free parking. Many of the users of this property daily will be able to enter or exit by a scanned parking pass, so our residents will have a fob type device on their cars. The other person will need to be able to pay a fee for using the Highland garage when they enter and take a ticket; they will pay on the exit.

The Highland Avenue entry and exit period in the middle of the garage will be for residents only. There will be no lower access that will immediately go up to the higher floors. Traffic is being controlled within the garage, that's very important. We will have someone monitoring the garage, that's an additional staff member.

All project resident/valet parkers will be required to use the garage for their parking. We won't be running over to people's lots in the middle of the night. We won't be blocking streets with backed up cars. We will be moving them directly into the garage.

All project employees will be instructed to park in the Highland garage. All full-time and part-time office and commercial tenants will be requested to park in the garage. There will be a full-time employee, as I said, to monitor that garage and make adjustments to the garage as needed and necessary.

We also will be putting in all three buildings and the garage a state of the art, integrated security system. It will not only be monitoring the security of the buildings via cameras, it will be also monitoring our fire safety system. It is going to be state of the art and it will be able to be accessed not only within our buildings but on mobile devices. It is going to be a major commitment.

Last, I'm going to talk about kind of, we have the income benefits of this for Arlington 425, and I think Mike is going to take that over. Thanks for your time, appreciate it.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Thank you.

MR. FIRSEL: Just a couple of moments on the economic benefits, because I believe that some of the variances requested require justification, and some of the other things we want to do here do as well.

APPROVED

Currently, this project generates about \$30,000 a year in real estate taxes. It's vacant, has been so for 20 years. The first years stabilized, which means when the buildings are finished, occupied, tenants have moved in, the taxes will be \$2 million per year. So, it will be an increase of \$1,970,000 in taxes. The five years with a very modest half percent a year increase, over five years it will be \$10.5 million and up from there.

The Staff report says that over \$5,200,000 will be spent from residents living in this project within a three-mile radius. I think that is a tremendous benefit for the downtown businesses, especially where people can easily walk to the fabulous offerings that we have downtown. Needless to say to the Village itself there, aside from the Village's portion of the taxes, there will be county RTA taxes per your website of 11.25 percent. The building permit fees alone, I think a million is very low. Of course, the annual vehicle sticker, pet license, and all of the other fees, I think it was three pages long of all the fees on your website that will come about. We expect, I believe the Staff report said about 417, we believe it will be more new residents spending their money and living in Arlington Heights.

I just wanted to give you a little breakdown of that real estate tax, because that's a big, big number. We don't expect, and the Staff report I believe even mentioned, we don't think we're going to have even 25 students in the entire school system from this project. Usually are not in transit-oriented development. The three school districts are now receiving \$20,000 a year. Combined, they will receive the first year of stabilization \$1,340,000 in taxes, or over 66.5 percent of the total amount of taxes. Deb's library fund, over \$99,000. The Park District, over \$100,000. Cook County and the Village itself from its current share will receive \$252,000 a year in property taxes in addition to all the other taxes.

This project, as you can obviously tell since we have mentioned it, the Village has not offered nor have we asked for any incentives, monetary incentives from the Village of Arlington Heights for this project. This is 100 percent private equity, private money. So, we just wanted to put the economic benefits of this on the table so everybody can see that not only is it a fabulous development, it's going to help the finances of the Village, the school districts, as well as the businesses in the downtown.

With that, we conclude our presentation and thank you for your time. I apologize; it's hard to do a project of this magnitude in any shorter period of time. It was going to be shorter but I got sidelined a little bit.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: With all those side issues.

MR. FIRSEL: Thank you so much.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Thank you, Mr. Firsell.

MR. FIRSEL: Of course we're here to answer questions.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Thank you. Okay, just to, there's a lot of people in the audience, and just to let you know the structure of how the rest of the meeting is going to go, we're now going to move to the Staff report. They're going to tell us their perspective on the project. Then, depending on the wills of the Commissioners, I think we're going to proceed immediately to asking for comment from the members of the audience.

In preparation for that, can I see a show of hands of about how many people might be interested in coming up and commenting? So, okay, not as bad as I thought. Okay, and then we will, after your comments, we will close the community part of the meeting, and the Commissioners will deliberate.

So, Sam, if I can ask you for the Staff report?

APPROVED

MR. HUBBARD: Sure. Thank you, Chairman Ennes.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: All 30 pages of it. It's pretty extensive.

MR. HUBBARD: Yes, I'll try to go through this fairly briefly.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: I know you do that.

MR. HUBBARD: So, the subject property is part of the northern three-quarters of what's known as Block 425, bounded by Sigwalt, Campbell, Chestnut and Highland Avenue. The majority of the property is within the B-5 Zoning District, a small portion on the southern end is within the R-3 District. The property is classified as mixed use in the Village's Comprehensive Plan.

The Petitioner is requesting four specific zoning actions this evening. One is to rezone that southern piece of the property into the B-5 District. A planned unit development is also required as per the B-5 Downtown District regulations. The Petitioner is also proposing to consolidate the 17 existing platted lots on the property into one lot to accommodate for the development. Additionally, they are requesting a land use variation to allow residential uses as a principal use in the B-5 District. That's only for the proposed building along Chestnut Avenue.

They're also requesting seven variations which you've heard a little bit about this evening. Any time the Plan Commission determines the validity of a variation and deliberates on that, variation approval is subject to four criteria as outlined in the Village code. We can see the four criteria here. The Staff report went into great detail relative to each of the variations and how they conform to the criteria necessary for approval. In the interest of time, I don't want to go through individually all the variations, but we do concur with the Petitioner that the criteria for approval has been met on the variations and I'm happy to answer any questions on any specific variations.

In addition to multiple meetings with Staff to get this project ready to appear in front of the Plan Commission, the Petitioner has also taken several formal actions to-date to finalize their plans and get them ready for the Plan Commission this evening. Back in September of 2018, they sent out about 800 invitations to a neighborhood meeting. From what I understand, it was very well attended. We did have Staff from the Planning & Community Development Department at that meeting, and their summary of the events of that meeting was contained in the packet to the Plan Commission.

Additionally, in October 1st of 2018, the Petitioner appeared in front of the Village Board for an early review where they received preliminary feedback from the Village Board members. Based on comments that evening and from comments from the neighborhood meeting, the Petitioner revised their plans and presented them on December 12th to the Conceptual Plan Review Committee. Some of the notable changes at that time was the introduction of the porte cochere feature that provides access along Campbell, as well as the reduced height of the previously proposed 5.5 story building on Chestnut to four stories in height. I would characterize the feedback from the Conceptual Plan Review Committee as generally favorable. There were some questions on loading, move-ins, move-outs, parking, and affordable housing, but the Conceptual Plan Review Committee instructed the Petitioner to move forward through the process.

Additionally, the Petitioner met three times with the Design Commission, culminating in a final meeting on March 12th of this year where they received a favorable recommendation of approval subject to a few conditions, mostly minor relative to some

APPROVED

materials, colors, and detailing on the building. Finally, the Petitioner will need to appear in front of the Housing Commission at a date to be determined. They're still finalizing their affordable housing details and the Village is still discussing that with them. That will have to occur prior to appearing before the Village Board.

So, you can see an aerial of the subject property here. To the north is Campbell, to the west is Chestnut, south is Sigwalt, and on the east side is Highland. Here is the proposed development superimposed on the aerial. I would say that this is a long-awaited development proposal for a key piece of Downtown Arlington Heights that has sat vacant for many years. The development would accomplish one of the Village Board's 2017 strategic priorities which was to facilitate redevelopment of this block, and Staff is encouraged by the proposed development which we feel is a viable and strong proposal that would accomplish redevelopment of this vacant block, would provide energy to our thriving downtown area, and would also provide long-term positive economic benefits to the Village.

So, just a little recap here. You can see the Highland building outlined in red. It's 125 units. It has a small space for ground floor commercial. That would be 13 stories, the bottom of which will be six stories for the garage and then residential above, with the 13th story containing the amenity features of the building. The actual tower portion you can see outlined in yellow. It's not the full width of the building, it's only the back portion.

The Campbell building is outlined in red as well. It's 182 units. It would have basement retail, and retail and nonresidential uses on the first and second floor. Parking for this building would be shared between the Campbell building and the Highland building; it would take place all within the Highland building garage. This building would be nine stories tall.

Finally, the Chestnut building on the west side of the site. That's 54 units, four stories, and 84 parking spaces in a garage that would service only this building. This building is all residential.

Generally speaking, we feel that the site is very well designed and well thought out. It has excellent circulation. As you've heard, off-street loading occurs throughout the interior of the site, and much of those actions do not occur on the street. It keeps the shorter building along the Chestnut side and keeps the taller building isolated to the center of the site so that it's as far away as possible from neighboring properties. The architecture is well done, it involves a lot of high quality building materials and it is a well thought out and executed site plan.

Again, Mike touched on some of the economic and fiscal benefits so I don't want to go in too much detail. But again, we think probably the most important feature of this development is the additional spending that would take place within three miles of the property. Over \$5,000,000 additionally would be spent by residents living in this development over a year. Much of that would be captured by existing and future businesses in Arlington Heights.

Impact to the school district, we used the formula that they use to project future enrollment, and that estimated about 32 children would live in this development. If you take this formula and apply it to some of the existing developments in Arlington Heights, it typically over-projects the student population within the development. So, while 32 children is what's predicted by the formula, given the high number of one-bedroom and studio units, we don't think that there would actually be 32 children living in this development. We did run this by

APPROVED

the school district, School District 25, and they did not express any major concerns with this project.

I do want to touch on the Downtown Master Plan which was adopted in 2008. It's a long-range plan that provides a vision for how Downtown Arlington Heights should develop into the future. The plan goes block by block and lays out general development parameters for key downtown properties, one of those being Block 425. It's important to note that this is a guiding document, it's not a code requirement. So, while we take these recommendations of the plan into consideration when evaluating a proposal, they are not strict code requirements.

So, we evaluated the proposed development in relation to the Downtown Master Plan which calls for this development to be six to eight stories in height. The Chestnut building is certainly consistent with this, in fact less than the six to eight-story threshold at four stories. We think this is appropriate given the location of the Chestnut building. The Campbell building at nine stories is also generally consistent with the Downtown Master Plan. However, the 13-story Highland building is not consistent with this plan.

We would note that the Highland building does comply with the height regulations of the B-5 Zoning District where it's located. When taking into consideration its location, the impediment of the Vail Avenue Garage built up to the property line, and the lower height of the Chestnut building, the Staff Development Committee is supportive of the 13-story building height.

Any PUD is required to demonstrate conformance to certain criteria in relation to any variations requested. Again, this was done in detail within the Staff report. We feel that the variations meet the criteria within the code relative to variations associated with the PUD. I'm happy to go into detail if the Plan Commission would like to hear more detail, but in the interest of time we will state that staff believes the criteria for PUD variation approval has been met.

One of the key site design elements that we focused on was the proposed porte cochere where the driveway goes through the base of the Campbell building. When this project was originally proposed, this element was not included in the original design. But as a response to concerns over traffic, the development introduces this porte cochere prior to appearing before the Conceptual Plan Review Committee. While we believe that there are some positives to this feature, we do have to evaluate it both from the positive and negative sides.

On the pro side, this feature allows for enhanced off-street pickup and drop-off within the porte cochere underneath the building. It allows ingress and egress along Campbell which reduces traffic along Highland, although its impact is minimal since the traffic study doesn't show that a high percentage of traffic would be using the porte cochere.

On the negative side, we note that it eliminates three existing on-street parking spaces along Campbell. These are free on-street parking for the downtown residents and business and they're very popular spaces, so we note that those would need to be eliminated as part of this development. Additionally, it disrupts the pedestrian walkability along Campbell by introducing ingress and egress. You're going to have cars, you know, driving across the apron and approach into the porte cochere, and that has an effect of disrupting pedestrian walkability.

We also analyzed this in relation to on-street parking. So, there are

APPROVED

currently nine on-street parking spaces located on the south side of Campbell. There are five, I'm sorry, five on-street spaces on the north side of Campbell, there are seven spaces on the west side of Highland, and there's 24 spaces underneath the Vail Avenue Garage. On the east side of the development, there are 13 spaces.

So, in conjunction with the development, certain of these off-street spaces, I'm sorry, on-street parking spaces, are going to be eliminated. At the north side, those five spaces are going to go down to three spaces. The nine spaces will go down to six, seven to four spaces, 24 to 13, and 13 to 10. So, that equates to a total reduction of 22 on-street parking spaces. Again, these are popular spaces for, you know, patrons of the businesses downtown, and while we recognize that, you know, some on-street parking is going to need to be eliminated to accommodate for this development, we believe that it should be managed to the best extent possible.

So, dovetailing on this, I want to talk a little bit about loading. Loading for this property is, as I mentioned, very well designed. There are seven loading spaces on the interior of the site. You can see them highlighted here in red. In addition to those seven spaces, there are smaller spaces for, you know, parcel pickup or drop-off, UPS, that type of thing. Then there's one on-street loading space along Chestnut in front of the Chestnut building.

The Staff Development Committee has recommended the elimination of the two loading spaces along Highland Avenue for several reasons. Primarily, this is going to eliminate six existing on-street parking spaces along Highland Avenue, and it's also going to introduce loading operations and staging along the street which is already, you know, somewhat congested and has a loading zone across the street for the Metropolis building. It's also directly adjacent to one of the primary entrances and exits to the Vail Avenue Garage.

So, we are encouraging the Petitioner to continue to explore alternatives to eliminate this loading area. We believe there are alternatives on site where it could be located, specifically the space could be expanded here, or some of the bike parking could be relocated or eliminated here to accommodate for some of these loading spaces. So, there are viable alternatives that we believe the Petitioner should explore relative to elimination of this loading zone.

Relative to traffic, there are five primary ingress and egress points to the development. As you've heard Luay go through some of those, I'm not going to repeat them. But understanding access to the site is important to understanding how traffic will function as a result of the development.

The Petitioner prepared a traffic and parking study in conjunction with their application which analyzed and projected the expected number of new trips to be generated by the development during peak hours. Morning peak hours would be 8:00 to 9:00 a.m., and evening peak hours would be 5:00 to 6:00 p.m. Based on the expected directional distribution, we focused our analysis on two key intersections that would handle the largest increase in traffic as a result of this development.

On the north side, the intersection of Highland and Campbell is currently under stop sign control on the southern leg of the intersection. 18 percent of the trips in the morning, that would be 32 trips, would travel through this intersection, and 28 percent of the evening peak trips, 87 trips, would travel through this intersection. Although the traffic study said that, you know, additional stop sign control was not warranted, it did suggest that the Village consider additional stop sign controls. The Village agrees that all-way stop sign control at this

APPROVED

intersection would be an enhancement to traffic and pedestrian safety. So, as part of this development, they will be adding stop signs to the east and west legs to make this a complete stop sign controlled intersection.

In relation to Sigwalt and Highland, it's currently under stop sign control at the north and southern legs. About 66 percent of the trips in the morning and evening would travel through this intersection. That's about 115 new trips in the morning, and 210 new trips in the afternoon. Similarly, the traffic study did not find that additional stop signs were warranted at this intersection but suggested that the Village consider their implementation. The Village agrees that their implementation would improve traffic and vehicular operations at this intersection. So, as a result of this development, this intersection will be under four-way stop sign control.

Lastly, I want to touch on parking. This is probably the most important unresolved issue from Staff's perspective. In our parking analysis, we analyzed it three different ways. First, we analyzed it relative to code requirements. We also analyzed it relative to the ITE, Institute of Traffic Engineers, parking generation manual which is a nationally recognized and accepted standard for forecasting projected parking demand. We also analyzed it based on data from similar developments in Arlington Heights and surrounding suburban downtown communities.

Strictly based on code requirements, 455 parking spaces are required, and 544 spaces would be provided which results in an 89-space surplus. So, relative to code, the proposed development is compliant. But we really wanted to look at the parking areas separately. The Chestnut building has its own parking area specifically dedicated just for that building, which would provide 84 spaces for the 54 units in that building. That's parked at a ratio of 1.56 spaces per unit. We believe this to be sufficient and we don't take any issue with parking for the Chestnut building.

So, that turns our attention to the Campbell and Highland buildings. From a code standpoint, 395 parking spaces would be required and 460 parking spaces would be provided. That's a 65-space surplus. That equates to roughly 1.05 spaces per unit in the Campbell and Highland building. But based on the Petitioner's traffic, I'm sorry, the Petitioner's parking study, we found that on average, comparable downtown suburban residential rental developments were parked at a ratio of 1.27 spaces per unit. In addition to this, recent surveys from the Vail Avenue Garage and North Garage suggest that parking for residential rental developments in Downtown Arlington Heights is closer to 1.31 spaces per unit. So, the proposed parking at code requirements, 1.05 spaces per unit, we don't believe is adequate.

As a worst case scenario, we also contemplated parking at 1.5 spaces per unit. We have historical data that suggests parking for rental developments in Downtown Arlington Heights are parked at that rate. Additionally, in the Petitioner's data from comparable downtown suburban residential rental developments, we also found that some of them on the high end were parked at 1.5 spaces per unit. So, the 1.5 spaces per unit represents a conservative approach towards analyzing the parking.

We asked that the developer use ITE modeling to forecast demand for the nonresidential uses within their development. We combined these numbers with what demand would be for the residential uses if they were parked at either 1.5 spaces per unit and 1.3 spaces per unit. The table on this slide illustrates what parking demand would be based on these two scenarios. In any scenario, we found that there would be a deficit of parking at peak

APPROVED

times. We found that peak commercial demand per the Petitioner's study was 157 spaces, which would occur at 10:00 a.m. on a weekend. If we compare this to the recent information that we received this evening, that 135 spaces would be reserved for commercial spaces, there's a slight deficit there.

So, we would like additional time to analyze the data presented by the Petitioner. We're asking for a detailed parking management and allocation plan that explains how many spaces will be shared, how the spaces will be dedicated to residential and nonresidential uses, how access will be restricted and monitored, and what fee will be charged for nonresidential parking spaces. This is important because if fees for nonresidential parking is less, I'm sorry, is more than what the Village charges, then that could shift parking outside of this development onto the street and into the Vail Avenue Garage. Furthermore, if the development cannot accommodate for its peak parking demand for residential uses, that could also shift parking outside of the development and into the Village's system, on the street, and in the Vail Avenue Garage.

So, there are several key parking related questions that are unanswered. Again, is there sufficient parking within the development to accommodate for peak parking use at all times? If parking demand can't be accommodated in the development, then overflow would occur in the Vail Avenue Garage, and on-street parking spaces, which would have a negative impact on the Village's parking system. We'd like further study on whether 1.3 spaces per unit or 1.5 spaces per unit is appropriate. Then given the shared parking model, we'd like to have more details to understand how parking will be allocated and shared within the Highland building garage for the residential and nonresidential uses.

So, we appreciate the information that Petitioner has provided this evening. This is the first time that the Village is hearing some of these details. We haven't had a chance to sit down and analyze them. So, we are recommending continuance of this application to allow the Petitioner additional time to address issues as raised within the Staff report.

If the Plan Commission wishes to consider a recommendation, we have prepared a list of conditions for you this evening, and I'm happy to go over those in detail if you'd like. That concludes the Staff portion, thank you.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Sam, is that different than the list that we have?

MR. HUBBARD: No, that's the list that you have.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Sam, thank you for your report. Can I have a motion to approve the Staff, or to accept the Staff report?

COMMISSIONER DROST: I'll make that motion to accept it.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: And a second?

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Second.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: All in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Anybody opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay, we are going to move to the public portion of our hearing. What I'd like to ask, I'd like to have some procedure here. It's obviously going to be a long meeting, so I'd like to be able to speed things up as much as possible. What I'd like to pick is a person who wants to come up first and then, you know, if you want to speak to us, I'd like to ask that the next speaker come up and sit in this front chair on the corner so that as soon

APPROVED

as that person is done, they're able to move up and state their comment.

When you come up to the microphone, I ask that you state your name and spell it for the court reporter again. Please spell your last name. Again, it helps, you don't have to give your address, but if you want to it does help us. Your testimony should include facts relative to the project.

Just to let you know, the Plan Commission is charged with considering petitions involving subdivision and consolidation, special uses, planned unit development, rezoning, land use variations, and amendments to the zoning regulations. Obviously, parking and traffic flow are one of the important issues and I expect to hear some concerns about that. If one of the speakers before you has made your point, please let us know that you concur with them but we don't need to hear it all over again, and I think the other people in the room will be happy to not have to listen to the exact same point again.

When you finish, remain at the microphone for a moment to see if there's any questions from the Commissioners. If not, go back to your seat and the next speaker will be able to come up, whoever else wants to speak, until we have nobody in that front seat. At that time, we will close the public portion of the hearing, and then the Commissioners will deliberate.

So, who wants to be that first, please come forward.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Can I make just one point?

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Yes, please.

COMMISSIONER DROST: As we go forward, obviously the Village has recommended a continuance because there's issues that are not answered, and sometimes when you come before us and address them, we might not have the answers. So, depending on what the Commission decides, we can defer on some of the questions that might have been raised. So, just --

MS. KASELOW: Somebody left their glasses here.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, those are mine. They're not. But just as a point of order here.

QUESTIONS FROM AUDIENCE

MS. KASELOW: I'll try to remember everything you said to do. My name is Judy Kaselow, last name spelled K-a-s-e-l-o-w. I live at 200 West Campbell Street in the Campbell Court Condominium building, and I've been a downtown condo owner and resident for almost 19 years. I'm an original owner, and I'm here tonight to voice the concerns I have as a resident regarding the Arlington 425 development plan.

So, my concerns are not based on all the data that you presented here tonight which I was unaware of. You know, the only thing we got in the mail was this notice of a public hearing to petition the setbacks, so I didn't know any of this, what the other presentations, you know, and data was.

All right, so, anyhow, my personal concerns have to do with a number of proposed large, tall buildings on a site with very limited space and the environmental issues that they will create if this plan is allowed to proceed as currently proposed from an already resident position. My concerns are as follows:

The first one is the proposed three buildings consisting of 361 new

APPROVED

units would cause two to three times more traffic volume and congestion that already exists in this area, on Campbell Street particularly, mainly through all of the delivery trucks that show up everyday that either have to double park or use the no parking spaces in order to make their deliveries. So, we're going to have even more trucks coming and going in that new Campbell Street building on Block 425.

The second issue is about the shallower setbacks that are being requested by the developers for these three buildings, anywhere from seven feet to over 12 feet closer to the public street frontages in order to cram in these three huge buildings on just three-quarters of a block. This will become a density nightmare if you allow it to happen. Street noise will increase considerably because when tall buildings face each other too closely on narrow streets to begin with, traffic noise becomes concentrated and amplified significantly, as is already experienced by the condo units in both the Metropolitan Lofts and Campbell Court building that face Campbell Street and each other. We also have an echo effect that travels up floors and amplifies the traffic noise that now exists. The street noise will get much worse if these new buildings are set that much closer to the three streets that form the boundaries of the northern part of Block 425.

Please don't allow this change in the current setback allowance to occur. It's bad enough as it is. Our buildings are set back 13 feet from the street and we still have that echo amplification going on with just the existing buildings that are there. So, if you lessen than by half, can you imagine what the noise level will be on Campbell Street? Intolerable for those of us that face Campbell.

Another concern of mine is that most of the proposed 361 units are rentals, are going to be rentals, which will create a more transient population with leases being as short as one year, and it will result in higher turnover rates with residents moving in and out of these new buildings on a more frequent basis than now occurs since we're owners of our buildings.

My last concern is that many of these new residents will probably be taking a Metra train to Downtown Chicago for their jobs and other reasons. Is our current Metra Station large enough to safely accommodate the increase in ridership? Particularly during the morning and evening rush hours? I don't think so. It's already crowded enough because I've taken the train during rush hours.

So, for these personal reasons as a resident of Downtown Arlington, I feel that the Arlington 425 plan as currently conceived is really development overkill in my estimation, if you allow three tall buildings, two of which now are going to be another story higher than was presented to the residents last September. I don't know, this is just going to harm rather than enhance the downtown area for those of us that live there 24/7. Therefore, I would hope the Arlington Heights Plan Commission will vote to have the developers revise their plan and reduce, I know this is probably not going to happen, the number of planned buildings. I think just two of those buildings facing Campbell and maybe Chestnut Street would be fine. But that monstrosity going up next to the parking garage is going to be 13 stories high and, you know, well, because they have to have a big garage, you know, it's just going to be a nightmare.

I would like to increase, not decrease, the proposed setbacks of the buildings to reduce street noise, perhaps have green areas in front of the building facing Campbell, not just behind it. That's not going to benefit those of us that live on Campbell Street. We need greenery in front to absorb some of that echo effect that you get when you put so

APPROVED

many close buildings opposite one another. 19 years I've been there, I know. So, you know, I think they need to go back to the drawing board.

I know it's a great tax benefit to the city and the Village. But you know, talking about quality of life for those people that want to live there for extended periods of time, you don't see this kind of development in any other community along the Metra lines. They always have green areas in front of their buildings. Their streets are wider to begin with. Remember, the streets that now exist were built back in the days when Arlington was a small little town and they're not wide. When you have tall buildings coming right up to the sidewalk on these narrow streets, it just produces a noise level that's not pleasant. The pubs are now attracting more motorcycle traffic and people with loud double exhaust pipes, you know, so on the weekends it can get pretty lively and noisy as is.

You know, it just seems like there's too much going on on just three-quarters of a block, and that's what I have to say. Hope you'll consider my remarks.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Judy, thank you. Do any of the Commissioners have questions for Judy? No? Thank you.

MS. KASELOW: All right, thank you.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Good evening.

MS. HARP: Good evening. Lauree Harp, H-a-r-p. I live at 44 North Vail. I live in the Village Green Complex which, very similar to 425, it's not really different. It's just a different time. I'm sure that people looked at the Village Green project when it was being produced as something that was going to be a detriment to Arlington Heights as well.

Anyway, I do know some of you, but for those of you I don't know, I'm a 40-year resident of Arlington Heights and I do remember what this downtown looked like when the Daily Herald offices were on 425 and were cobbled together on that block. The street, you could throw a bowling ball down the street at 5:00 o'clock and there was still no parking even though there was no parking garage. So, some things never change.

As a 19-year resident of Village Green moving downtown, I have lived with the advantages of the changes made with the original downtown TIF bringing a new way of life to our community. We now have businesses offering goods, services, food and entertainment. We didn't have that when I first moved to town 40 years ago. In order to maintain that vibrancy, we need to have Block 425 built. Adding more residents to the downtown will add to the people who can walk to the stores, shop the Baby Jewel, keep them open, the cobbler, the bank, the cleaners, making dinner reservations, buying tickets to Metropolis, just to name a few of the advantages to living in a downtown area where you can walk.

Our master plan calls for this type of development in this area, and we now have a developer bringing this opportunity after many years to enhance the growth and development of our community. I have noticed this particular developer attending meetings on past projects, listening and learning from the input of the Village Board, the Village Staff, and the residents, to create a very desirable plan to add to and enhance our community.

I support this project and hope that you, as the Plan Commission for the Village of Arlington Heights, find this project worth supporting and can move this project forward to approval to the Village Board. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Thank you, Lauree. Are there any questions for Lauree?

(No response.)

APPROVED

MS. HARP: Thank you.

MS. LICHTER: Good evening, everyone. My name is Rebecca Lichter, L-i-c-h-t-e-r. I live at 115 South Highland, so excluding the apartment building on the corner of Highland and Sigwalt, I'm the fourth house in. So, we'll be able to see all of this going up including what's going in on the south end from our front steps.

So, I'll be as brief as I can. I'm a bullet point person so I'm just going to run through these. I appreciate the Petitioner's attention to detail on all three buildings. I appreciate that they've been listening to the residents' feedback and concerns, and addressing them in incorporating everything. I am beyond happy with the recommendations for the all-way stops on Highland and Campbell, and Highland and Sigwalt. I'm very happy about that.

I'm also very glad that affordable housing will be included. I think that's really important for the downtown area. So, I'm glad to see that actual residential units will be provided instead of just lump sum payments.

I'm also encouraged by the willingness to coordinate with plans for the south end. I like that there is some interest in doing that to make it look cohesive and to consider each other's development. So, I appreciate that as well.

I concur with a couple of the other people that came up. I still have concerns about traffic and parking. I also concur about the question on Metra. I believe, I take the Metra at least three days a week, sometimes four, and I believe our stop is, I want to say the fourth busiest in the entire system. So, I'm curious if there has been any contact with Metra about what the additional riders might do, if there will be enough space.

I do have a question, several questions actually. On traffic and parking, I noticed in one of the artifacts that there was a mention that there might be a hope to have a rooftop restaurant. I was curious if, from a traffic and parking standpoint, if any of the scenarios ran included whether or not a rooftop restaurant would be included in those scenarios.

Also, I was confused, on this rendering, the Highland Avenue residential entrance shows inbound and outbound, but I thought earlier on it was stated that it was an inbound only. So, I just wanted some clarification on that.

Also, in looking at this, my last question is the Highland Avenue entrance to the north in between the Campbell and Highland buildings, I'm just wondering if there had been any consideration for when that part of Highland gets blocked off for some of the festivals that are downtown and what that might do to traffic coming in and out using that entrance. That's all I have.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Thank you. Are there any questions? No. Thank you.

MS. LICHTER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Yes, sir.

MR. KING: I am Jerry King, last name is K-i-n-g, live at 205 South Chestnut. I just want to thank the Petitioner for the wonderful work that they've done in putting this project together. My wife and I moved to Arlington Heights in 2010, and at that point we were looking at Downers Grove and Elmhurst and Arlington Heights. My wife is from Arlington Heights originally, she grew up here, and one of the things that we did was we looked at the master plan. We saw what the vision was for the Village and we fully support that, and quite frankly, it was part of the reason we moved here, because we want a vibrant downtown and we think that this really is quite a magnificent project that does an awfully good job of trying to

APPROVED

balance a very difficult piece of property. Between Chestnut being residential on one side and the Vail Garage going right up to the property line, you're not going to have something that's pure perfection here.

So, I guess I would just ask that you not let a very, very good solution get in the, you know, just go away because it's not perfect, because perfect doesn't exist. Thanks much.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Any questions? Mr. King, you said you live on Chestnut?

MR. KING: Yes, 205 South.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Are you across from the development or north and south?

MR. KING: We are not. We're two blocks south of it basically.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay, thank you.

MR. KING: Yes, anything else?

CHAIRMAN ENNES: That's all.

MS. PETERS: Hi, my name is Lisa Peters, P-e-t-e-r-s, and I live on the 600 block, 600 South Highland block. I'm also the manager and potential owner of Vanessa's Modern Bride on Campbell Street in Downtown Arlington Heights. So, I have concerns both as a resident and as a merchant towards the density of the project.

I've called this neighborhood my home my entire life. I've lived here and I'm now raising my children six blocks from where I grew up. I have worked my entire career on Campbell Street. So, I've seen and lived through all of the various projects in town.

I have a concern business-wise regarding where my customers can park when they come to see my store. I am not a, I do not typically draw my customers from the high rise buildings here in town. I am a destination. On a daily basis, I hear complaints from my clients about how much of a nightmare it is to not only get to my store, but to find a place to park that's reasonable for them to come in. I'm concerned about losing business because it will only create more traffic, more congestion.

I appreciate the fact that, you know, there is parking that is being allotted for the residents, but I also have concerns about their guests. I have concerns about, you know, restaurant patrons and all of that. It will in fact affect my business and I'm concerned about it.

As far as a resident on the 600 block, I am quite a few blocks away. However, with the entrances to the two main buildings being on Highland, it will create traffic on my residential street. I already have quite a bit of traffic on my residential street because people from the south end of town driving to the parking garage drive right up my street and into the parking garage. I do it every single day, I drive up my street and into the Vail Street Garage. I'm just concerned with the density and the in and out right on Highland in addition to the Vail Street Garage exiting on Highland. People will be using Highland as a cut-through to get to 90 to go to the city because, as much as everybody says they're going to be riding the train, not everybody rides the train. So, that is a concern of mine.

I also understand, you know, that it is again going to be a benefit to a lot of the merchants in town. It's going to be a benefit to restaurants, entertainment, that kind of thing. What about your businesses that have been here? We've been located in the same spot for 22 years. What is the benefit to those merchants who maybe are more of a destination?

APPROVED

You know, how does this help them gain more customers?

I also, I'm not against the actual renderings themselves. The Highland Street building though to me looks like a hospital, like the addition on a hospital. You know, I just hope that you take into consideration existing residents, existing businesses and what their concerns are, and not just creating this marvelous block that has been vacant, which I understand it needs to be developed at some point, but I just think that this project is too dense.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Are there any questions for Mrs. Peters? I have a couple.

MS. PETERS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: So, what is your business again?

MS. PETERS: We're the bridal shop right on Campbell Street, right in downtown in between Dunton and Vail.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay, my daughter was one of your customers. Why do you, so people say they have trouble parking on Campbell?

MS. PETERS: Everyday. We are by appointment only, and my customers on a daily basis are late for their appointments because they cannot find a place to park. In particular, it's from, you know, your peak times like from 4:00 o'clock in the afternoon until through the evening, because the restaurants are busy. Downtown is bustling and that's a good thing, but I don't have anywhere for my customers to park and I'm concerned about losing business if there is more development with less parking. You're already taking away, what was it, like 22 spaces or 30-some spaces?

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Possibly. But the development, depending on how the parking count is or how it may change, supports all the parking requirement it has. It shouldn't be putting people on the street other than if they want to park on the street to go to some of the retail establishments in the building.

MS. PETERS: But the residents will also park on the street. The merchants will also park on the street.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: But the residents of those buildings will have --

MS. PETERS: If they're only going in for a short amount of time, they're going to park on the street. It's what happens in the downtown area on a daily basis. We see it all day long. I'm just concerned about a lack of parking and a place for customers of the downtown businesses to actually be able to park.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: You don't think that if somebody lives in one of those buildings, they're going to park their car, and if they need to run to a restaurant or a shop downtown, they'll run there, they're going to get their car out?

MS. PETERS: No, I'm not talking about that. I'm talking about like if residents are out running errands, they run home, they're going to park on the street if there is a spot. That's one less spot for a customer. They're not going to, if they're only going to be in there for a short amount of time --

CHAIRMAN ENNES: They would have the right to do that, yes. Okay, thank you.

MS. PETERS: Okay, thank you.

MS. DIRKSEN: Good evening.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Good evening.

MS. DIRKSEN: My name is Courtney Dirksen, my last name is spelled D-i-

APPROVED

r-k-s-e-n. I have been a resident of Arlington Heights for about 15 years and we live on the 200 block of South Walnut right now.

I was going to touch on many of the things that Lisa just went over regarding existing businesses, especially the small ones, the mom and pops that are on, I guess that would be the east side of Vail on Campbell. I am one of those people who lives within easy walking distance of Downtown Arlington Heights, but we are running to and from lots of things, and I am often one of the people that although I do not need to park there because my house is close, I need to run in somewhere on my way home, or I need to drop my daughter off at the Metropolis on my way to drop my son off at basketball. So, I completely agree with everything she said. I also had concerns about the Metra question, so I'm not going to revisit those.

I want to say that I am very happy to hear that there will be affordable housing units. I think that that is a strong feather in the cap of this development. However, I have concerns about parking that will be charged for on a monthly basis. It sounds like that might be part of the business plan. For people who need affordable housing units, to expect them to pay a premium for a parking space in a luxury garage I think is very shortsighted and unrealistic. They're not going to be able to swing that. So, those folks have to go somewhere with at least one of their cars if they're not included in an affordable unit rental price would be my one thing, the first thing that I would ask you to consider.

The second thing is that I think given that we're losing a lot of already free publicly available spots along the streets, I don't think it's an unreasonable request to ask for at least the first level, maybe the first two, to be open to the public. I think that that isn't an unreasonable thing to ask. There's a lot more traffic by virtue of the residents which may be accounted for to some degree, but also by just the amount of traffic that those buildings would bring in.

I have some concerns about the loading and unloading docks, and I'm not sure if this is just, you know, my limited understanding of those. But I'm more concerned about the residents of the buildings who don't want to park on the sixth floor of the Highland garage and then go down the elevator under the street and up to the fourth floor of their Campbell unit seven times because they've got a big grocery load, or because they've having people over for a birthday dinner or whatever. Like where are those kinds of short-term park and run upstairs with a large shopping order going to happen? Right now they happen when people double park on the street, that's where they happen now.

So, those are the main things, and then there was one other thing I know I'm forgetting. Oh, I was going to ask about, I understand that the parking garages won't necessarily be connected for cars, but I think it would be a lovely addition to have them be accessible via pedestrian walkways so that they're more interchangeable. I had concerns about people's willingness to pay for parking in a garage adjacent to one that's free for the Village, but I think the Staff report already addressed those things. I think that that about sums it up.

I will say that even on the 200 block of South Walnut which is where I am, in very busy times, we get cars parking on our street. So, parking at peak times is already an issue and I, you know, ask everybody to take that into consideration as they have been doing, and especially consider opening up those first two floors, maybe the first floor only, to public parking that's accessible to everybody for no cost. I think I agree with some of the comments about the aesthetics of the giant glass block building. I think that there needs to be some improvement there but that's probably more Design Commission territory.

APPROVED

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Yes.

MS. DIRKSEN: Thanks.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Before you leave, are there any questions? Okay, I guess I'm firing these. I have a concern also with the neighbors about losing some of the quick short-term parking for stop-in, because on Campbell I use that cleaners. If we take away the parking on both sides of the street, I like a lot of other people are going to have to park a little farther away.

MS. DIRKSEN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: But that's part of development. But I have a question for you.

MS. DIRKSEN: Well, I think it's part of development for you, but it's a loss of business for your cleaners.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Exactly, I'm concerned about that.

MS. DIRKSEN: Yes, okay.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: But my other question is in regard to your comment that this private development should provide free parking to the public.

MS. DIRKSEN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Why should they do that?

MS. DIRKSEN: Because they're taking spots away from the public that are already accessible in order to develop this.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: They are providing spots and they've even indicated that some --

MS. DIRKSEN: But I think that the Staff report demonstrated there's a net loss of spots in addition --

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Depending on what study we're using. That's going to be something we deliberate.

MS. DIRKSEN: Yes.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: She's talking about the street parking loss.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Right.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: You're talking about the 22 street parking loss?

MS. DIRKSEN: I'm talking about the street parking along, I appreciate the fact that Chestnut is going to be widened, like it's really difficult to get up and down that street when there is parking along the east side. Totally agree with that, really have been seeing it.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: So, they're giving part of their property up to do that, to get it widened.

MS. DIRKSEN: To widen it, but there's no more spaces for cars. They might be widening the street but there's --

CHAIRMAN ENNES: But my question relates back to this is a private development, and you indicate that they should provide free parking to the community. You don't even want people parking in front of your house on public streets.

MS. DIRKSEN: That's not true.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Oh, I thought you said it gets parking there and you wished they weren't there.

MS. DIRKSEN: No, I don't wish they weren't there. I'm saying that if at the

APPROVED

200 block of South Walnut I'm getting people parking on my block, then I think that speaks to the fact that there is a general shortage. Frankly, you know, when I meet my friends from Long Grove to have a business dinner, to talk about like potential things or even to go out socially to Tuscan Market, try finding a place to park at Tuscan Market at like 7:00 o'clock in a Thursday. It's really hard, right?

So, I think that those street parking options are a big deal, and I think that it's unrealistic to think that people are going to willingly go in and take a ticket and pay whatever they're going to pay in a private garage when they can walk 500 feet and take up a space in the public garage, even if they are a patron.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: The public garage.

MS. DIRKSEN: Right, that's my point. So, I think that it's, I don't think it's realistic --

CHAIRMAN ENNES: But why should they provide free parking? I just don't understand it.

MS. DIRKSEN: I don't, there is nothing in the law that says they have to do it. I'm saying that it is a good idea. It's part of being a community.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Ms. Dirksen, a question to clarify this. What I think I understand your point to be is the private development is taking 22 public free parking spots --

MS. DIRKSEN: Yes.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: To handle all the egress and ingress, and they're then going to charge if you want to park there.

MS. DIRKSEN: That's it.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: So, they're basically taking from the public free parking and they're adding --

MS. DIRKSEN: Replacing it with paid parking.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: A feed parking would be the substitute. So, that's what I understand your concern to be.

MS. DIRKSEN: That is my concern, and I also just think it's like a neighborly thing to do. I mean, this is --

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: I just wanted to clarify that, thank you.

MS. DIRKSEN: Yes. It's also just a nice thing, you know. Not everything has to be a money-maker, you know.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: All right. Thank you.

MS. GUNDERSON: Hi, my name is Joanne Gunderson. It's G-u-n-d-e-r-s-o-n. I live in Metro Lofts at Campbell and Dunton.

I'm in support of this project and I echo the comments of Lauree Harp and Mr. King. I think that this is kind of a capstone of the master plan, and I think that this is what we've needed for a long time. I'm sorry about the dogs that won't be able to use the lot anymore.

I had concerns coming in about parking and traffic, but I think those have all been addressed. I really like the solutions that they came up with to keep a lot of the loading inside the building, or inside the courtyard.

My other concern is something, we haven't talked about it, maybe it doesn't need to be addressed here, is the ComEd and making sure that our power grid is

APPROVED

updated and upgraded to make sure that we can accommodate that and what's already here, because I know we get brownouts and things like that that set off triggers in our building. So, hopefully, that's all part of the infrastructure that's being planned. But I'm fully in support and I hope that this project goes forward.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Thank you.

MS. GUNDERSON: Thanks. Any questions?

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Can I ask Staff? As part of the project that's going on downtown this summer, does any of that have to do with adjusting, increasing the supply of electricity from ComEd?

MR. WITHERINGTON-PERKINS: No, the improvements are storm sewer primarily and Nicor running all new gas lines, main lines and connections to pretty much every building. So, those are the major projects.

We have met with ComEd about a year ago, and they have two main services that come into downtown. They did provide us a report and we had had some reports from businesses and residents living downtown talking about brownouts. ComEd said they're not brownouts. What happens is when they need to change the load from one line to another, there's a slight flickering and a slight switchover, but that's not what they call a brownout.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: So, it's not a loss of power, Charles?

MR. WITHERINGTON-PERKINS: It's just a momentary transfer. They have said to us verbally that, you know, depending on the developments, and we've given them plans with all the potential developments, they may need to bring another service into the downtown. But that would be dependent upon meeting individually with each developer, and I believe the developer has had meetings with ComEd as well.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: It sounded like you said that was one of your requirements, they have to have adequate electric?

MR. WITHERINGTON-PERKINS: Correct.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay. Sir?

MR. RATAY: My name is Kevin Ratay, R-a-t-a-y. I live at 15 North Vail.

I have a slightly different perspective than a lot of the residents here today. I spent the first 21 years of my life growing up in Arlington Heights, and I spent the last 12 years in the city of Chicago, primarily in the West Loop neighborhood. The primary reason I moved back to Arlington Heights to largely get away from projects like this that have an altering effect on a neighborhood, especially a small one and a compact one like Arlington Heights.

My primary concern and one thing I didn't hear addressed was, we talked about hours of foot traffic, I didn't hear anything about hours of construction and the restrictions that would be put to that. So, that's my first question.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: But that can be answered. Right, that is spelled out. Mr. Firsel, would you like to comment on that? That was something that I don't think you mentioned, but it's regulated by the Village, right?

MR. FIRSEL: Yes. We intend to adhere to the Village code strictly as it relates to hours, days of construction. Power construction should they build this project is on several projects in the Village, some very large projects in the Village. More than familiar with the regulations and requirements here within the Village, and you have our and, I can hopefully speak for them, their assurance that we will comply with the construction time limitations set forth in your code.

APPROVED

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, what's the timing on the construction? Give us sort of an overview, if this plan is approved, how long will it take to start and finish in your schedule?

MR. FIRSEL: I can't tell you when it will start. The duration?

COMMISSIONER DROST: Or I'm looking for the timeframe, when it starts, when will it end? Give us --

MR. FIRSEL: Thirty months.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Thirty months?

MR. FIRSEL: Sixteen to 18 months for the first phase once we put a shovel in the ground.

COMMISSIONER DROST: And how many phases?

MR. FIRSEL: Two. Everything is being built in phase one except the Chestnut building and that portion of the Chestnut building not underneath the fire lane between Chestnut and Highland, and hopefully the parking's lighting on Chestnut.

COMMISSIONER DROST: In the conversations you've had with this new potential developer for the south end, how does that fit in to the construction?

MR. FIRSEL: They're going to be ahead of us. They're going to, they want to be in the ground this September.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Can we take that to the bank?

MR. FIRSEL: You have to ask them when we get here.

COMMISSIONER DROST: All right, that was pretty certain.

MR. RATAY: The second part of that question I guess is hours of the day and actual days of the week as well, so that I think turns back to Arlington Heights then. What are the restrictions on that? Because I left the power construction site down the street, understanding it's Chicago, but they got going at 7:00 a.m. everyday and also did Saturdays full day, so that's a concern.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: I think they do start at 7:00 and go to what? 3:00-4:00?

MR. WITHERINGTON-PERKINS: The ordinance allows construction to start at 7:00 unless they have special approval from the Village Manager. I think Saturday is a slightly later start, I'm not sure, and I don't believe they're allowed on Sundays.

MR. RATAY: Okay, thank you.

MR. WITHERINGTON-PERKINS: Having said that, people are mobilizing before that but they're not supposed to have any equipment running before 7:00.

MR. RATAY: Okay, thank you.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Charles, since you answered that, how long has this zoning been in our Village plan, the current --

MR. WITHERINGTON-PERKINS: The B-5 zoning?

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Yes.

MR. WITHERINGTON-PERKINS: '77, late, yes.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: '77. But for this property which has been vacant since the 90's?

MR. WITHERINGTON-PERKINS: This was formerly the Paddock Publications office and printing facilities. They vacated in early mid-90's and moved to a new building and the buildings were torn down. It's been vacant since then.

APPROVED

CHAIRMAN ENNES: So, this has been a potential site for this for way too long.

MR. RATAY: Sure, sure. The other thing that I will mention, just having friends in the construction industry, is the way that it's often skirted those hours is there's nothing about when trucks can start arriving. It's about actually constructing starting and stopping. So, trucks will begin coming in a half hour to an hour before that 7:00 a.m. time every weekday, just a point to share.

My other concern was already touched upon, but I think you mentioned electrical issues. I just wanted to make a recommendation to, I think it's the 200 South Campbell, or 200 West Campbell. I live across the street from, or lived across the street from a project very similar to this. It was 214 Tower, buildings going up, and they had each of the buildings that neighbored it install essentially a seismograph but I believe it's called a building vibration monitor because the construction was causing each of the buildings to vibrate on the neighboring streets. So, this was put in I think partially to insure the construction and the developers, but it was definitely an alarm to us and the neighbors seeing, it's hard to see but it's just there. It's a monitoring system because it was causing all the buildings to vibrate on the neighboring streets.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Sure.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, there was a building in San Francisco that tilted.

MR. RATAY: Yes, Joe Montana is an investor, yes, yes. He's not happy. Those are my two points, thank you.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Thank you, Kevin. Any questions? Okay.

MR. OLSTED: My name is John Olsted, I'm a resident of 200 West Campbell. So, I'm right across the street, a neighbor if you will, but across the street from the proposed development.

We've been in the area for three years, came from another suburb. We came here because we love the look of the downtown area, we love the position of the Campbell Street Condominium, access in and out of the building. Downtown development is beautiful, and the proposed development looks beautiful. I think they've done a lot of things to try to accommodate.

I'm not, I will tell you right off the bat, I'm not a big fan of putting apartment buildings in downtown development areas. I think it does increase transient traffic. It does, when people have an investment in the community, especially in a downtown area, they have more likelihood that they will maintain the building, they will maintain the residences, and therefore, you get a better long-lasting building.

But that issue aside, we've got a developer here who is proposing something, I understand that, and you're not likely to hold off until you get a developer that's going to put condos instead of apartment buildings. However, my biggest concern is the same concern that's been expressed already this evening is traffic. I will tell you today, a couple of things, one, when I leave my building every morning, and I work, I go to Aurora everyday, come back, I am very wary of leaving my garage because traffic at 6:30-7:00 o'clock in the morning, no, not 6:30 and 7:00, but certainly 7:00 to 8:00 o'clock in the morning is high enough where, and the parking spots that are out there right now are dense enough where I can't see traffic very well. If I have to leave though on a weekend or in the evening when, you know, on a Thursday,

APPROVED

Friday, Saturday, when traffic is full downtown, it's a scary event.

So, traffic is a problem down there. The idea that 1.5 ratio of parking spots to residents is realistic I think is ridiculous. I'm even concerned about 1.5. Now, my wife and I are older, but I still work. We have two cars, we actually have more than two cars. But in order for me to accommodate those two cars that we use all the time, I get one car in my building which I suspect tenants will get in this apartment building, and then I have to rent another spot over in the Highland parking garage, right. I don't think that's all that unusual for a working couple to need two parking spots. I get there's math and formulas and averages.

I will tell you nobody ever asked me or my wife how many spots we have or require. I don't know where the data comes from in terms of averaging out how many parking spots people need and what studies are made. I'm sure it's scientifically appropriate, but I don't think it's adequate for the residents, A. B, the idea that you're going to add a lot of additional commercial properties which is great for the downtown area and the development, that's fantastic, but the idea that that parking garage will accommodate all that additional traffic with unknown types of commercial properties there to need to be accommodated is, I think isn't realistic. I think in this development, there needs to be a much higher level of parking to accommodate that. I think if you don't do that, five years from now or less, you'll be taking all of that money that you're collecting today, that \$1 million or \$2 million or \$5 million, and you'll be building a new parking garage because there won't be enough spots in the city to take care of that. All that money we're planning on spreading around to the library and to the school will have to be put into a new parking garage downtown because there isn't enough space.

So, you've got an opportunity right now to deal with that. I would add one more thing. I've built buildings myself in my career. Now I'm in manufacturing, I'm not in development for commercial or residential properties. But I will tell you I was always reminded that it was a privilege to build something within a community and that I had to honor the requests of the residences and the requests of the city. While the city certainly valued a great deal what I brought to the city, they also did it within certain constraints. We can't feel bad as a city to say we love this property, we want it, we want the revenue from it, but we have certain guidelines that we feel need to be satisfied to take care of the realistic issues associated with that construction, and we shouldn't feel bad about asking for this. So, any questions?

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Thank you.

MR. OLTED: Thank you.

MS. HEMPHILL: Hi, I'm Kerry Hemphill, H-e-m-p-h-i-l-l. I'm also at 44 North Vail, friends and neighbors of George and Lauree. I completely concur with Lauree.

My husband and I moved here nine years ago, almost 10. We saw a big billboard in 425, it said coming soon. We kept waiting and waiting and waiting, and nothing came. We have finally seen the plans and heard what you plan on doing, and we're really, really excited about it and we really, really support it.

A couple of things that I just want to say that hasn't been said. I like the fact that, because I'm board president at 44 North Vail, and I take great pride in things like what Debbie was saying where they're going to have staff and they're going to monitor the garage and they're going to make sure that things change. We have a shared surfaces parking that all we had commuters parking. We took ownership back and now we have residents and retail patrons parking there.

So, I do believe there's a scare tactic or fear because of the

APPROVED

unknown, but I believe this is a very strong team and they're going to make sure that this is a premier building like all the other premier buildings that exist in downtown. I'm also looking forward to the steak restaurant. We need a high end steak restaurant please. So, that's all I have.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay, any questions?

COMMISSIONER DROST: No, just a transparency moment here. I am a resident with Lauree Harp and also with Kerry. I've been a long-term resident and seen the development of the Central Business District and have been on the Plan Commission from that, well, too long maybe. But I'm also a business owner, so I'll have some comments related to that, so that others in the audience realize that, you know, there is an investment on this Commission in the community.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: We have a stake there.

MS. HEMPHILL: Wait. I'm sorry, I have one more thing.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Sure.

MS. HEMPHILL: I also heard that renters could be an issue. I have to tell you that some of the best residents in our building are renters. They are renting because they are here and they don't need to buy, and they are upstanding citizens in our building. So, you know, we're in a spot now where renting is needed. So, I think that's going to be a good thing, too.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Thank you. I think we saw you before.

MR. KING: You did.

COMMISSIONER DROST: He's good looking.

MR. KING: Jerry King, 205 South Chestnut. I have a couple of incremental things to say about parking. First of all, this is a block that the landowners of this property have been giving parking spaces away for free for years now, because if this property had normal ingress, I'm not a real estate guy, you know, if it was a normally functioning property, there'd be driveways cut into it. So, how much are you really, you know, you've been getting free parking for years, shouldn't they be able to use some of those parking spaces to get in and out of their property?

CHAIRMAN ENNES: No, those are street spots.

MR. KING: Pardon?

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Those are street spots.

MR. KING: Well, they're street spots but I know that there are no driveways cutting into that where normally you would have that.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Right. So, the question is the number.

MR. KING: Yes, the number. The other thing I would say is I'm hearing that Arlington Heights has a problem with parking downtown. Okay, I get that. But I don't, what I'm struggling with is how all of that incremental problem is now this landowner's problem. Why is it all their problem?

CHAIRMAN ENNES: It's not all theirs.

MR. KING: You know, so, thanks.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Thank you, Mr. King. Just to go back to Staff quickly, there's a parking study being done that's not done yet, right? It is done?

MR. ENRIGHT: This is why I'm here.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: You actually know the answer to this.

APPROVED

MR. ENRIGHT: We did do a parking study in 2018, a very extensive parking study that had nine days of counts throughout the day into the late evening at 2:00 a.m., 6:00 a.m. starting. They did it Thursday, Friday, Saturday over three separate weekends, May, June and July of 2018. Now, those are snapshots in time. Some of that was during Sounds of Summer in which we saw spikes. There's no doubt that peak times on the weekends, Thursday, Friday night, Saturday night, Saturday afternoon, that the on-street parking downtown is, in the south side of town is 100 percent utilized.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Right.

MR. ENRIGHT: The first level of Vail Garage is typically 100 percent utilized during peak. The fourth level, second and third are permit only for residents, the fourth level is about half to three-quarters filled at peak, sometimes higher. Fifth level is about half full at peak, sometimes it can get a little higher on that, but on average there is space on the fifth level. People don't like going up there though.

The Village Board has authorized us to greatly enhance the Vail Avenue Garage where we have a request for proposals out right now that are due in mid April to have a parking guidance system installed in the Vail Avenue Garage. It will be several hundred thousand dollars. So, we're in the process of obtaining bids from various companies throughout the country to greatly enhance the user-friendliness of that garage and give us data on a minute-by-minute basis, 24/7, 365 days a year, where people are parking in that garage so we'll have a much better understanding of how to manage it.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: So, better information, not a bigger garage?

MR. ENRIGHT: Yes, we can't go up. We already did that once. It can't support another level up, and we have no place to go.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: South?

MR. ENRIGHT: Unless we go south. But keep in mind, if this project is approved, you've got 465 spaces in their garage plus almost 1,100 in our garage. I'm not so sure we want any more parking in that area because you're really going to have, bringing more traffic to that part of the downtown.

Having said that, one of our concerns with parking in the development is not just the loss of on-street parking, that's kind of secondary. It's just the fact that people coming to this development, people going to the restaurants, whatever ends up there, retail, aren't necessarily going to park in the developer's garage. They very well may park on-street or in the Vail Garage which is pretty packed, at least the prime spots. So, that's why Staff is recommending that some of the spaces in the developer's garage are available to the public free of charge to kind of balance that out, because if they have to pay to go in their garage, we think that's going to be more people going into our garage and exacerbating the situation in that garage right now.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, on the congestion problem, did you guys get any anecdotal information when Arlington Heights Road was closed and how that traffic increased in the downtown area? I mean, it was really quite apparent, even people reading signs and just ignoring them, it was people just wanting to get to A to B as fast as they could. Charles?

MR. WITHERINGTON-PERKINS: Not any quantifiable data. I mean, a lot of the traffic was peeling off in different roads or being diverted, Golf Road to 83, and then

APPROVED

people diverted at Sigwalt. So, it wasn't like the 24,000 vehicles on Arlington Heights Road are going through downtown.

COMMISSIONER DROST: No, they didn't, but you can see just from an anecdotal standpoint about how much congestion there was and sort of extrapolating that experience into a more dense development and how to manage it. When you talk about the security cameras, too, is that going to be linked up with public safety basically for an enforcement standpoint when problems are seen on the street? Will it expand to the light ceiling at Harmony Park, you know, we can watch the activities and, you know, get a certain sense of the rhythm of where that traffic goes and how to manage it?

MR. WITHERINGTON-PERKINS: There's already certain cameras at certain points from a police safety point of view. This is not a police surveillance system that Bill talked about. It may have that capability, depends on how the software works between the two systems.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay, we can, yes, our next.

MRS. KING: I am not a public speaker, I'm a nervous wreck. I never stand up in front of people.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Are you a neighbor? Are you a neighbor?

MRS. KING: Yes, I'm Marlene King, I'm Jerry's wife, 205 South Chestnut. I just have to say I'm thrilled about this project. I think it's exquisite, I think it is gorgeous. We met in Orland Park and we hated it there.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Long way from here.

MRS. KING: Yes, and we couldn't wait to get out of Orland Park. You have to drive to everything. There is no community, there is no downtown. There is nothing vibrant, exciting about it. It was horrible. We moved here and I grew up here. But it was better than it was when I grew up here when we moved here nine years ago, and it's getting better and better and it's more exciting. This project is incredible.

I guess I just, I have a question about I don't understand when people move into a downtown area of a very, you know, high end suburb, they're three blocks away from the downtown, you could throw a rock and hit the Metra and they don't like the congestion. To me, there's Iowa, there's places farther away, you know. I mean, I just don't understand, you know.

I will say I love children, we don't have children. There are some of the cutest kids I've ever seen in my life right around six blocks of where we live. I love them all, they're precious. But a lot of the neighbors are saying they're upset about all this because if there are children. I'm like I love the children, but why did you move a block and a half away from the Metra and then you're going to veto every possible growth project because you're worried about the congestion? So, you know, you could move nine blocks south. You could have moved to Rolling Meadows, there's nothing going on there and you're not going to have any of these problems.

But to me, all I'm saying is I'm ecstatic. I think it's gorgeous. I think even though the largest building that has that glass, there was a couple of objections to that, I love it. It does not look like a hospital to me, I think it's beautiful. So, for whatever my opinion is worth, I just hope that you will approve all of this. If there's little issues with the parking, you know, maybe we can, I don't know, I'm not getting into the nitty-gritty, I'm speaking from my heart, you know.

APPROVED

CHAIRMAN ENNES: We'll do that.

MRS. KING: But there's a great lifestyle here that I never had before, where I lived before.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Thank you, Mrs. King. So, should we take that comment out of the minutes about throw the rocket to Metra? No, okay.

MS. CHURCHILL: Hi, my name is Cindy Churchill, I live at 1 South Highland. I am also not a public speaker, so bear with me.

I do like the project. I do not want the project to move forward as is. I just wanted to focus my comments on the word transition in the master plan I believe. This is, that lot is located between the end of Central Downtown Business District and a residential area which makes it a transition property. So, regardless of what it's zoned, whether B-5 or R-3, it should be, and again I don't know everything that makes it called a transition property but it is designated a transition property.

So, my thought was that a lot of the problems would go away if the density, so many problems seem to come out of the density of it. So many residential units, so many cars, so many. So, a lot of that would go away if it was built in that definition so that the buildings that border it, the 1 South Highland, the Campbell building are all eight stories, and then the residential are obviously one or two stories, so if all of the buildings on that land were between eight and one, that would relieve a lot of the problems in terms of traffic following density. So, instead of 13 stories and nine stories and four stories, something like eight and six and four would seem to me fit the definition in the master plan of what a transition property is.

I did have two questions for the developer. I notice on one of the slides that the Highland on-street parking becomes private access for residents. So, I'm wondering which residents that includes. Is that just the residents of the 425 property or would that be residents, those of us in Metropolis use it as well?

MR. WITHERINGTON-PERKINS: I can answer that. The proposal is just for the development.

MS. CHURCHILL: Okay, so just, then I would concur with the discussion about losing 22 on-street parking units for those of us who live in the area and who come to just go in and out to the cleaners or things like that. It's a significant loss and a change to our quality of life. I'm sorry, I had one other question but I can't say it right now.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay, thank you, Cindy.

MR. SCHWAB: My name is Joseph Schwab, I live at 12 South Chestnut, right across the street from this project.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Joseph, could you spell your last name please?

MR. SCHWAB: S-c-h-w-a-b. I have many concerns as people voiced about construction, dirt, parking. I have possibly a suggestion, and I know the Village, with this plan, it's less than a year in conception and it's come a long way already, possibly doing a feasible study about putting diagonal parking instead of parallel parking throughout the Village. Because for every four spaces, typically parallel parking you have 27 feet, and for every four spaces you can get 10 cars in if you do diagonal parking. So, if you take a consideration or do a study as far as taking diagonal parking on just one side of each street in downtown, you may double the parking spaces throughout the Village.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: That's a consideration for the Village. How would that affect this property?

APPROVED

MR. SCHWAB: Well, if you change it throughout the Village, and diagonal parking, especially on Chestnut take a little bit more space with diagonal parking instead of four spaces that you have there, five spaces on Chestnut, you'll create 10 or 11 spaces.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: But that makes the streets narrower, right?

MR. SCHWAB: That you have to take in consideration, taking a little bit away from the street, but you're widening Chestnut anyway. With the implementation as of March 2018, all new vehicles have to have rear cameras. So, I know this won't go through quickly, but taking that in consideration down the road, it might be a doable process.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Thank you.

MS. CAYER: Hello, Melissa Cayer, C-a-y-e-r. What does affordable housing mean? Will current taxpayer property tax bills go down?

CHAIRMAN ENNES: I'm a property tax guy, and as far as will it go down, I don't think they'll ever go down. I don't mean to be light on that, it's just for as long, I've been doing this 35 years, they constantly keep going up.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Well, let me ask you this question, Mr. Expert.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Yes.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Will property values go up in the surrounding area in your --

CHAIRMAN ENNES: From this development?

COMMISSIONER DROST: From this development.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: I would think so. I would think because of the income, the commercial property, other commercial properties in the area are going to benefit from all these residents. But to answer your question about the affordable housing, I'm not an expert on it. We're all aware of it, basically how it works. I don't know if any of Staff wants to comment on it. There's a commission that deals with that. Are you talking about what the rents would be or something?

MS. CAYER: What does it mean to be, you know --

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Well, it is, correct me if I'm wrong, but it is, the rent on a unit is set by regional Chicago Metropolitan income figures based on the theory that 30 percent of the median rent in like the Chicago Metropolitan Area should go towards your housing. Based on that number for the Chicago Metropolitan Area, they set what the rental rate would be.

I should ask the developer, since you've been working and talking about this, is that basically right as to what the rents would be, Mr. Firsel?

MS. CAYER: The Chicago Metropolitan --

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Median income. They use that level and they say 30 percent, or actually they say 60 percent of that median.

MR. WITHERINGTON-PERKINS: It's 60 percent of the median income, and then it's based on whether it's a one, two, three-person household so their annual salaries can vary as they have a larger family.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Charles, I knew I should have asked you.

MR. WITHERINGTON-PERKINS: Then the premise is they don't pay more than 30 percent of their annual income on housing and associated housing costs. We do have on our website a lot of information, if you go to vah.com, it has a lot of information on, you know, definitions of affordable housing and things like that.

MS. CAYER: Yes, I was looking for it on there but I couldn't find it.

LeGRAND REPORTING & VIDEO SERVICES

Chicago & Roselle, Illinois - Miami & Orlando, Florida

(630) 894-9389 - (800) 219-1212

APPROVED

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, we just recently had experience on the Campbell, on the Dunton and Eastman development.

MR. WITHERINGTON-PERKINS: Sorry, what was the question?

COMMISSIONER DROST: There was about 15 units in the Dunton and Eastman development, the recently completed one.

MR. WITHERINGTON-PERKINS: Yes, there's a number of affordable units in downtown. Dunton Towers has 20 percent affordable units because that was financed through an industrial revenue bond. Their percentage of average income is a little higher, that's a little higher than 60 percent because of the funding mechanism. Park View I think is what you're referring to.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: So, there's a number of developments as well that have it.

MR. WITHERINGTON-PERKINS: They have affordable units as well.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: I think to answer your question, basically the affordable housing, the affordable units in this complex will be cheaper than the other units to rent.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Thank you. Yes? That was quick.

MS. IWANIK: Hi, my name is Sandra Iwanik, I-w-a-n-i-k. I live at 200 West Campbell Street.

I just want to reiterate what the people have said about the parking. I'm having a lot of problems with the parking in the area. I think there's just not enough space from what I understand. My friends, they won't even come to visit because they say I can never find a place to park.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: To visit you at your home?

MS. IWANIK: Yes, across the street on Campbell, and they're going to remove some of that parking spots?

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Well, east of you.

MS. IWANIK: So, to me it's a big concern, as well as that rooftop. Is that a for sure or that hasn't been decided yet?

CHAIRMAN ENNES: I think it's if they find a tenant.

MS. IWANIK: Pardon me?

CHAIRMAN ENNES: The rooftop restaurant?

MS. IWANIK: Correct.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: I think if they find a tenant. But they would have to have the parking for that.

MS. IWANIK: Yes, because on weekends, I hear from the restaurants the young people screaming and yelling, so I can imagine what the rooftop is going to be like.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: I think it would be enclosed, right? The rooftop?

MR. FIRSEL: Pardon me?

CHAIRMAN ENNES: I'm sorry, Mr. Firsell, the rooftop restaurant, will this be enclosed or an open air?

MR. FIRSEL: It will clearly have a patio outside, especially in winter. No, it will be enclosed but it will certainly, like many restaurants, have outdoor dining areas.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Right, right.

MR. FIRSEL: The attraction of this restaurant will be, being 140 feet up, is

APPROVED

seeing everything around the entire northwest suburbs all the way downtown. So, there will be outdoor dining, but a big wall. So, no divers.

MS. IWANIK: And a bar I'm assuming.

MR. FIRSEL: Yes. Yes, but one of the conditions is that if we open a restaurant, it would be a full service with a kitchen. So, it's not going to be just a bar.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Plus, being on the roof, it will probably have to be closed earlier than --

MR. FIRSEL: Oh, yes, it will be enclosed and 100 percent, we will encourage 100 percent of the parking to be in the garage because there will be a direct elevator going up to that restaurant if we have one. If you frequent that restaurant, you don't have to look for parking space downtown because you're going to have one in the building.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: And you'll get a coupon and have free parking.

MR. FIRSEL: You get a coupon and you put that in the slot on your way out and away you go. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Thank you.

MS. IWANIK: I just wanted to mention about the parking. It's really a concern I think to a lot of the residents around here.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: I think if you stick around, you're going to see that's one of the main issues we talk about.

MS. IWANIK: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Nobody is in the seat, so we're going to close the public portion unless somebody has a comment. No? You sure? I mean, we haven't had you up here yet.

Okay, we're closing the public portion of the meeting. We will start down here on the north, Mr. Cherwin. How you doing?

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Oh, nice. Nice little surprise. Yes, so thanks. I was in the Committee; I have seen this project for a little while here. I think the developer has done a lot of great things with the site that has obviously a lot of impact here and a lot of challenges. I appreciate the residents for speaking up on both sides. I think they raised some great points.

I guess, you know, where I came down on this is, I think a couple of questions I'd ask, you know, I think my major concern is probably the net effect on parking. You know, I think just being involved in some of the industry events and everything I go to, I do know that the trend is probably to a lessening parking burden or requirement as, you know, new folks come in in rental properties. It seems like a lot of folks we talked to, there is a declining parking need in terms of rental residents. That doesn't change the fact that we've got businesses that are struggling. But I think as someone mentioned, it's hard to put all of those external issues on to this developer. You know, when I was in the lower parking garage today below the theater, there were a lot of open parking spots.

So, I think some of the efforts that our Staff is making in terms of evaluating, that should go a long way to optimizing. Even if certainly new spaces in the garage on Vail can't come on line, that will hopefully relieve some of the issues that the residents and business owners talked about, you know, and even creative thoughts such as Mr. Schwab's in terms of how some of that is aligned on the street makes a lot of sense in terms of looking at it going forward. There's only so much land in downtown.

APPROVED

So, my concern is really mostly going to be focused on the effects of this particular development and the concerns some of the Staff raised about the parking issues and really that sort of net loss. We kind of go back to those 22 spots that we're taking off of the street. I wouldn't normally say to a developer, even though I understand the Village's perspective on the, you know, parking, of course it's nice to have more parking, but I wouldn't necessarily put that burden on the developer except for the fact that we are dealing with a net loss of parking.

So, I guess I would ask maybe Mr. Firsell, you know, if we maintain that net loss of 22, what would be the basis for not sort of compensating the Village for those lost spots somewhere on the first level or whatever, even if you get to a net zero, and the rest of it, you know, put aside any deficiencies that the Village may see and what the development is creating and maybe additional parking beyond those 22 if you decide to charge, you know.

MR. FIRSEL: Okay, I will respond in this respect. First of all, we do not view this in any way, shape, or form as a loss of 22 parking spaces. The loss means you had something that belonged to you that someone is taking away. As this gentleman said, Mr. King said, there were eight driveways on this block. Eight. One or two spots for each driveway.

The net loss is stating that of what is there today we are taking 22 away. We are counting spots on the north side of Campbell, not on our side of the street, the other side of the street. We're being charged with replacing those. Most significantly is that when the Vail Street Garage was built, the part over Highland was not part of it. The part over Highland was an addition, as many of you are aware.

In that addition, the city has been able to park 27 cars on four stories and 24 cars on the ground. Normally, when you have a property that goes over a street, half to one side, half to the other side, okay, how much does this project get for its customers, its tenants on the side of Highland that abuts our property? Zero. The Village says these are our spots on your side of the street, and there aren't eight or 10 parallel spots along Highland as there would be were the garage not there. There's 24 because of the Village parking all the way up to our property line or within two feet of it because you have a wall, okay?

So, I take great exception to the fact that we are taking away 22 parking spots. I would argue that between what you would normally park on this street, on the four sides of the street, and account for reasonable access to and from this site at the locations we show, there's no loss and in fact a gain of parking that you would otherwise have. It is unfair, in our opinion, to burden this property with the Village's on-street parking issues. We did not create the 24 spots some of which are going away, and the hardship of that Vail Street Garage abutting our property is beyond, almost beyond comprehension as to what the added cost to this project is as a result of having to deal with it. But it is there, and what's there is there.

We have no choice but to build a 13-story building because we have to provide parking, because we can't do anything in that area. However, my direct response of replacing spots is we take great exception to the fact that we are taking away spots from the Village.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Well, I mean, you can take exception, you're just asking for a bunch of variances and we're having to look at the whole project as a whole.

MR. FIRSEL: Couldn't agree with you more.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: So, as you come and ask for all of these changes, as you know, we're looking at a holistic view and, you know, whether they're caused by

APPROVED

the garage or otherwise, I think the fact of the matter is it's 22 spaces that the way the development is, you know, basically current state and what the proposal is, is the Village saying that there would be, I mean, we've heard about some of the issues that are raised by the businesses, there would be a net loss of current state, you know, when I say taking, it's whoever's spaces they are, there will be 22 fewer spaces for on-street parking than there is now, right?

MR. FIRSEL: That's what it is, yes.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Okay, that's my question.

MR. FIRSEL: Well, let me add --

MR. WITHERINGTON-PERKINS: So, the biggest issue is how is the peak commercial demand generated by this development of 157 spaces, how is that going to be accommodated in the garage? That's the biggest question. You know, the 22 spaces, the garage going over the street, there's numerous examples around the country of garages going over the community's own public right-of-way. There was no taking, it went over the Village's public right-of-way. It's a public garage for people in the public to park.

But, you know, there's 22 spaces. We've got some ideas to, you know, minimize that by relocating those loading zones so you pick up six spaces. Then you'd only lose 16. They need to have access into their site for driveways. Every other development had some access to, you know, off the street for their driveways. So, you know, we're not saying that this development is, we're just pointing out facts of what the current on-street parking is and what the loss would be.

But the bigger issue is, you know, we need a detailed parking allocation plan to show how that peak demand for commercial at 157 is going to be accommodated. There also are some deficits. If you look at the back of your report, there are some charts that show weekday and weekends where there are some peak deficits. It's only for a few hours. We still think this is a good project, but we need a plan to show how that's going to be accommodated. That's a bigger issue than, you know, the spaces on the street.

Then the last point I just want to make so that everybody who is in the audience understands, we have studied angled street parking in the downtown. You have to do it in one-way pass because the streets aren't wide enough. We just completed a study of Vail and Dunton as a one-way pair, and you only pick up a handful of spaces. There are more negatives and concerns with fire safety, you know, emergency access, and then limiting access and shifting more vehicles from one location to another. So, for example, if Vail is one-way northbound or southbound, everything gets shifted to Highland for all those other movements.

So, for those reasons, we don't really pick up a lot of parking and it didn't make sense. But I did want to just mention that.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Thank you.

MR. FIRSEL: May I, I'm sorry, I didn't completely respond to that from another standpoint about the on-street parking spaces. We are strongly encouraging every retail and commercial customer to park in our garage. It is free. They don't have to look for a parking space. They drive right in, they take a ticket, they go to a restaurant, they go to a clothing store, they go to their office. They get a pass, they put it in the machine and they go out for free. Why would anybody who doesn't have to look for a parking spot, who doesn't have to pay for a parking spot, park anywhere but where it's most convenient to where they're going? It's readily available and it's free.

APPROVED

Keep in mind that also what Charles just mentioned about what are we going to do for peak hours, maybe a few hours on the weekend. As I said to Charles with Staff, you don't build a church for Christmas. Because we're going to have an extra 22 cars over the 32, we have an excess of 22 spaces in the garage on Chestnut. Note that the study that the Village has done completely disregards the Chestnut garage. There is no rule that says that on those peak hours, if we find that there is an issue, we can't ask employees to park in the extra spaces within the Chestnut garage. We don't see that as to why, with everybody clamoring about all the traffic and all the cars, we're already building 89 cars over your code, and now they want more. It's a non-starter. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Mr. Sigalos?

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: No, I certainly understand the parking and I certainly appreciate what you're saying as far as offering the Chestnut garage for people to be able to park and get a compliant amount. So, I think that's increasing the parking in the area, I mean, that they have there now, they don't have that ability there to do that now.

One of my questions really more had to do with the affordable housing. You said you're going to have some affordable housing. Are you, does that mean you're going to comply, I don't know what the requirement is, 15 percent? Is that what the requirement is? So, is that what you're saying, 15 percent of the 360-some units is going to be affordable housing? Or are you having some affordable housing?

MR. FIRSEL: We're going to have some affordable housing. We are currently negotiating, trying to negotiate with Staff and then appear at the Housing Commission and discuss the issue with them.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: So, it will be something, you're looking for something less than the 15 percent.

MR. FIRSEL: We don't know because we haven't finished our negotiations.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Well, I mean, if you're negotiating, it means you're looking for something less. If you weren't looking for something less, you're not going to negotiate.

MR. FIRSEL: It's not going to be 15 percent if you want a direct answer to your question, Mr. Sigalos.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Okay, all right. The other question, and reading through the Staff report, the Chestnut building which will be the last phase of construction, right now it's scheduled to be a rental unit. But at that time, it may be condominiums, did I read that correctly?

MR. FIRSEL: Very much so. That's a very, it depends on market conditions at the time. Condos, as you know, go up and down in popularity, as do apartments.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Right now, are you seeing them going back up at all? I know they've been down.

MR. FIRSEL: They've been down. If they're going back, they're not going back enough to warrant them to build, especially on speculation, condominiums. But we're talking 2.5-three years out.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: No, I understand.

MR. FIRSEL: So, there is a very strong possibility. I think Staff recognized it, and that's why they said if we want to make the first two buildings condo, we'd have to come back and talk to them about it. But we may very well make that a condo building or we may

APPROVED

make it rental.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Okay, well, my last question goes to Staff. Is this project being proposed and approved as a rental development? In other words, if they want to convert to condos, do they have to come back for that approval or they can do that on their own accord?

MR. HUBBARD: The first two buildings, the Highland and the Campbell building will be built as rental. If they wanted to change it to condo, they'd have to come back. The Chestnut building could be built as condo or as rental without having to come back if it remains the same.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: All right. Well, that's all I have right now.
Thank you.

MR. FIRSEL: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: I should point out, Sam, did you notice that Sue did join us a long time ago.

MR. HUBBARD: I did notice.

COMMISSIONER DROST: At 10:37.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Right, right. Yes, and you also forgot that I'm the former chair of the Housing Commission. I was a member of the Housing Commission for like six years.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: I didn't know that. So, you could have given us the details.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: I'm just saying, you know, I've been on Plan Commission so long that we all forget how long I was on Housing Commission before. Were you going to say something? It sounded, it seemed like you were going to say something.

MR. ADREANI: Hi. Good evening, everyone. My name is Bruce Adreani, and I just want to say thanks to our team. We've got a great team. You folks have a great team also, it's been a pleasure working with you. Hopefully we can continue discussions toward the starting and completion of this development.

I did want to point out a couple of things. This particular property has been in accumulation and acquisition for a long period of time, in which I take great pride in accumulating. We've had a lot of driveways on the property. There's been a lot of parking along the property. I do take great issue at the fact that people want to take away, that they feel I'm taking away spaces.

Number one, I worked recently to try to pick up a couple of extra spaces. Over by the loading zone over here, yes, so anyhow, the loading spaces over there, we've worked with Rob and Kelle to pick up two extra spaces along Highland over there, so that may help. If you recall, and maybe even some of the drawings and our reports show and have plans for the garage itself. On the lower level of the garage, there's blowout panels that they have, and it was anticipated we'd have ingress and egress to our property.

To say that we're taking away spaces in that area is completely false. That particular garage there, if you think about the area over Highland, it does come to our face, we were never compensated one penny for our development. Not one for our taking. Basically, what you do when you come up to the property, you take away one face by doing that. There's been 105 extra spaces afforded to the garage because of the Highland addition, is that correct?

MR. FIRSEL: More. That's without, it's 108 plus the 24.

APPROVED

MR. ADREANI: No, I'm taking into consideration the spaces on Highland and all the levels above.

MR. FIRSEL: It's 108.

MR. ADREANI: Okay, so anyhow, and the thing that, you know, that we're taking away are the ingress panels and the egress panels from that garage that go up to our property. We were promised that a long time ago and that's what we have shown here. Like I said, today we picked up two extra spaces just reconfiguring the loading zone over there.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: You're referencing the loading zone on Highland?

MR. ADREANI: On Highland, yes.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: In the back of the Highland.

MR. ADREANI: And that's why it's very important to keep that there because of the fact that if you took two more spaces and put it into our circle around, I don't know where they're going.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: That looks, is that a dock?

MR. ADREANI: Yes.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Like moving trucks can back in there, unload furniture and stuff for tenants.

MR. ADREANI: Moving trucks could back in, correct.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: And does it go straight into the building?

MR. ADREANI: It does. There will be access there into the corridor section of the building. Basically, that location would be the retail area. We have the generator just to the south of it, and we have the other areas that would lead into the common areas.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: So, delivery trucks could go in there, too, for your commercial tenants?

MR. ADREANI: Exactly, exactly.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Why would we want to take that away? That seems like such an important part of this development. We're always talking about we don't want delivery trucks on the street. Did I hear somebody say that we could get more parking spots by taking away some of these loading locations within their courtyard? Or did I mishear that?

MR. ADREANI: No, no parking in the courtyard.

MR. WITHERINGTON-PERKINS: The Staff Development Committee had recommended, first of all, liked the project but had recommended a continuance for two primary reasons. One, we need a detailed parking plan, you know, there's things we're hearing tonight we hadn't heard before, you know, that spaces would be free or whatever. We just need all that detailed plan written together so we now have parking that's going to be accommodated.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: I understand.

MR. WITHERINGTON-PERKINS: The second part dealt with the loading zones, I think Sam is trying to pull up a first floor plan. We don't have it?

MR. HUBBARD: We have it at the end of the slideshow.

MR. WITHERINGTON-PERKINS: That's okay.

MR. FIRSEL: We would reduce that loss from six spaces to four by not making the bump-outs as wide and we could get two spaces back and keep the loading zone.

MR. WITHERINGTON-PERKINS: So, there's two issues with the loading zone on Highland. There's concerns from the Committee, Engineering Department and others about congestion in Highland. It's right across from one of the main entrances into and out of

APPROVED

the ramp. It's darker there, you'll have trucks maneuvering and backing and blocking the traffic.

The second is, you know, trying to minimize the amount or maximize the amount of parking. I don't want to say lost parking spaces and offend anyone, but we're trying to maximize the amount of on-street parking. On their first floor plan, they've got a large bike rack area that is internalized and it's very large. Our thought was you could flip that and add one of the loading zones that would come off the internal courtyard. It would be somewhat similar to the Wing building right across from Jewel. They have their main entrance to the garage ramp and right next to it they have another door that's their loading zone. So, it would be comparable to that.

Again, trying to maximize the on-street parking would be for this development's benefit as well because of customers coming to this site. Again, everybody wants to park on the street first. So, those really are the two main issues that we felt needed a continuance to get resolved.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: And they basically come from the difference between using our parking data, the parking studies we normally do, and the new report that we're using or that was cited? Am I right or wrong on that?

MR. ENRIGHT: Could you repeat the question? I didn't get it.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: The reassessment of the parking from the numbers that the Petitioner gave us, you had them do a new study using some other parking statistics, and that's where the deficiency came from on that sheet, right? Wasn't that from a different report?

MR. HUBBARD: We had them do ITE iterations for commercial parking.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Right.

MR. HUBBARD: We had them prepare that.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: That's a different statistical study, right?

MR. HUBBARD: From code analysis, it's different. Then we had them include residential parking at 1.3 spaces per unit and 1.5 spaces per unit.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay, and that's where the deficiency is coming from?

MR. HUBBARD: Right.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: And I can understand you haven't seen this data and that's the big concern. You want more time.

MR. FIRSEL: They have the data.

MR. WITHERINGTON-PERKINS: We've seen the data, it's in the back of your report. It shows, you know, the two charts right at the very end, show the projected --

CHAIRMAN ENNES: But you haven't had time to analyze it?

MR. WITHERINGTON-PERKINS: They show the peak commercial demand and the projected deficits. What we are asking for is a plan on how the parking is going to work for this development. If it doesn't work, then there's going to be a peak of 150 people trying to park somewhere else downtown. We're not saying it's going to be all that way, but we just need to see and understand that detailed plan.

MR. FIRSEL: And what is wrong with a development who has retailers who provides sales tax, property tax, and everything else? The argument is basically that your users in your project who are going to be in business, who are retail shops just like any other shop should not be using public parking. I don't get it.

APPROVED

MR. WITHERINGTON-PERKINS: Again, that's not what we're saying.

MR. FIRSEL: It's exactly what you're saying, Charles.

MR. WITHERINGTON-PERKINS: No, we're saying we need to see the plan so we know that the parking system is --

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Eventually.

MR. WITHERINGTON-PERKINS: Yes, that's the first time we saw it tonight.

COMMISSIONER DROST: What do you mean use public parking?

MR. FIRSEL: Pardon me?

COMMISSIONER DROST: At our business, we're a law firm, we use public parking and we actually pay for it. We understand how to use public parking and we go through a process of educating our clients that come in where you park.

MR. FIRSEL: Sure, exactly what we're going to do.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Based on the information that we get from the Village that there should be adequate parking. Some periods of the day are better and we can schedule appointments to meet with our clients.

MR. FIRSEL: I guess our biggest issue and why I'm just a touch more animated about this issue is --

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, but I mean, we use public parking and we want to use it.

MR. FIRSEL: Oh, sure. The Village has a code, it has a parking code. We are required to comply with your parking code. The law doesn't say we have to park 1.5 to one. The law doesn't say we have to park peak hours. You have a parking code that requires 445 spaces, and we are providing 554 spaces. We don't understand how there could still be an argument that there is a deficiency in the parking we are providing when we are 20 percent in excess of what your code requires at no cost to the Village. That is our biggest problem, we don't get it.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Can I just interject? Because it just seems like we're going over and over and over.

MR. FIRSEL: Sure.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: And you've heard from two Commissioners very worked up. Can we ask some more questions now?

MR. FIRSEL: Yes, I apologize.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Thank you. First thing that I'd like to go back to is there were quite a few questions, and I was taking notes, from members of the audience that have never been answered. They just asked them and then we said we'll deal with them later.

MR. FIRSEL: Yes.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: I think we should answer some of them. I know a couple of people had to leave, it is getting late. We're used to that up here, but others have to go.

So, there was a question about during our festivals, Highland gets blocked off. How is that, this isn't my question, I'm just wanting to make sure the audience's questions are being addressed. Have we thought about that, how we'll adjust during festival time? Any discussions on that yet? I don't know which is, I mean, do you mean the north end?

APPROVED

I don't know, she had to leave, but the north end of Highland I think is what she means, right? Parking-wise.

MR. WITHERINGTON-PERKINS: Well, there are different events that we have downtown. So, some of the events where Campbell Street is closed, it's closed kind of right at that intersection. I think some events that intersection is open so it wouldn't be impacted, because if Campbell and Vail is closed, we usually keep Highland open for ingress and egress of the garage.

There's at least one event where Highland is closed which is the Rotary Center Run. So, that could present a problem for this particular development because that would, you know, definitely limit their access onto Highland.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Unless the route was changed.

MR. WITHERINGTON-PERKINS: Unless the route was changed, correct.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Right. I mean, so my thought process along this was if the project goes up, we will adjust the festivals around it. I just want to make sure that the question was addressed.

MR. WITHERINGTON-PERKINS: Well, most events that are on Campbell and Vail, when Vail is closed, Highland is always open, because that's the only way then for people to get in and out, or the southern portion of Highland is open and they have an access on the southern portion so they could allow everybody to exit and enter the garage that way.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Okay.

MR. WITHERINGTON-PERKINS: The only one I'm aware of is the Rotary Center Run that would close the whole thing.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Right. I wonder why you're aware of that. Maybe because you run it every year.

There was another question, someone asked on the plans about clarifying the Highland building access. They said at some point you had said that it was, I think they said that it was one-way but on the plans they were showing that it both had ingress and egress. Could you maybe just clarify that for the individual that had that question?

MR. FIRSEL: I'd be more than happy to. Thank you, and we appreciate you pushing us back to the questions because we want to, Sam, could you put up the site plan for us please? The question was the southern entrance and exit from the garage, from our garage would be for our residents only. The entrance only on the north would be into the site, that would be a public entrance for customers, drop-offs, pickups, loading, unloading, as well as access into the garage for anybody who has proper access to the garage.

So, I'm not sure if that answers their question, but the north entrance seemed to be the issue of what is it for and it serves only our garage, only for residents.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: There was a question about if the parking study included the rooftop restaurant use.

MR. FIRSEL: Yes, it does.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: I'm assuming it does, right, okay.

MR. FIRSEL: Yes. All the parking counts include both the rooftop restaurant as well as the first floor as you see to the north of the parking, our favorite discussion topic, the docks. There is retail in that area as well, and both of the counts in the reports, in the Staff report and in ours, include parking for both of those.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: The construction hours I think is answered.

APPROVED

Then there was a question of why not diagonal parking. I would just address that, that's not your concern, that's a Village concern and it's part of an overall global, right, there's various reasons why diagonal parking may or may not work in our town and you guys are working on that, right?

MR. WITHERINGTON-PERKINS: Yes. As I mentioned, we did study that and you have to do it in one-way pass and you don't really pick up a lot of spaces, and there are other mitigating factors that doesn't work for our downtown.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Yes, I think the big thing is our streets would convert to one-way and that could become incredibly frustrating for many of our people traveling through the downtown. Okay, so that was all that I wrote down from questions. So, I missed one.

MR. FIRSEL: There's one more.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: There was one more, what was it?

MR. FIRSEL: There was one, Commissioner, about the one that mentioned ComEd because they said --

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Oh, the ComEd. I thought that was addressed.

MR. FIRSEL: Yes, they did ask a question on ComEd. Needless to say, the last thing in the world we want for a luxury apartment building that's charging luxury rents and is brand new, to have any problem with electricity. We can assure you that we are not building anything until we know that we have the maximum capability of providing continuous, uninterrupted electric service to our project. It is not a question whatsoever.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Okay.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: I think there was one more question, it was the Metra.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Oh, yes.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: I once again can't put this on you but it is something I wondered as well being a person who takes the Metra five days a week. Depending on the day, we can be completely full on the Metra train at the Arlington Heights stop.

MR. FIRSEL: Yes, I used to ride the Metra from Arlington Heights, I lived here 20-some years. I took it when there were smoking cars. I don't know if any of you took it that many years ago. That was awful, and sometimes that was the only place you could find a seat.

However, whoever said that Arlington Heights is one of the busiest stops, they are correct, as is Arlington Park. I think the two Naperville stops are ahead. Then we have maybe one more, and then Arlington Heights and Arlington Park. As we are aware, there are additional apartments going up at Arlington Park which is a stop before Arlington Heights and you're lucky you stop before going home.

However, I think the point is well taken and we will have a discussion and we should discuss in conjunction with the Village if they're so inclined to talk to Metra, let them know what's coming and how they intend to address the issue. So, I appreciate the, it's something I hadn't thought about and we will absolutely look into it.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Mary Jo, when you said it's completely full, what's full, the car or the station?

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: The car. From my experience, even in the coldest weather, not many people are actually in the station, but then again the train I take you

APPROVED

board from the middle so you're not boarding from the station side. But, so it's the cars.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Okay, so as a 29-year employee of Metra, I could probably speak to this.

MR. FIRSEL: Oh, good.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: I've seen him add cars to trains.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: So, you don't have to worry about the station, the station itself and the platforms are more than adequate.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Right.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: What you have to worry about is the cars. They're short of cars now, so it's going to be tough getting more cars, but getting the seats is going to be a bigger problem on the train than space in the station.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Didn't they just order a whole bunch of new cars?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: There's new trains?

COMMISSIONER DROST: They've ordered new cars.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: They ordered new locomotives. Cars are coming but it's going to take a couple of years.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Well, this will be a couple of years to go.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: No, they'll look at the ridership. They'll look at the ridership for the cars. The train crews record the ridership. When the train gets overcrowded, they have an extra car and they put it on. But there's a whole host of other issues with adding cars to a train.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: There was one other question which I was intrigued by. They said if someone has an apartment in the Campbell Street building and they have five or 10 grocery bags and they have to drive into the Highland garage to park, or is there some way they could actually unload the groceries and so forth before they park? Just a practical, logistical question.

MR. FIRSEL: Sure, that's a very legitimate question. The easiest answer is that we will have in the lower level, we'll have grocery carts. So, someone can take a grocery cart, fill it with their groceries, take it up to their apartment. Next time they go down, they can bring it back.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: But can they park there, do they have to go park in the Highland garage before they transport their groceries upstairs?

MR. FIRSEL: As to the Campbell building, we will discuss and take into consideration those two covered loading zones, to be able to access a cart in the loading zone, just put your groceries right into a cart, park your car, come back and then take your cart up. As stated, these are going to be under 24/7 surveillance with personnel on site. So, we believe that it's a very legitimate question, but logistically we feel that we will be able to handle that question. We've asked it ourselves. It may not even be a package, it may be something larger. Arrangements can easily be made to bring in something as long as we know that you need to use the loading zone for a couple of minutes.

In addition, the Highland building, as you see on each side, each has a loading dock. So, if it's something a little larger, you want to pick up a television or some furniture or something, each of those, those two buildings as well as the Highland building all have loading docks as well.

APPROVED

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: I think your neighbor just wanted to be reassured that you had this --

MR. FIRSEL: Yes. We absolutely will. You're correct, forgot to answer that.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Commissioner Dawson, would you like to finish up?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: All right. Well, I didn't even get started with my questions. Okay, so I think just general, before you get all angry at me --

MR. FIRSEL: No, I'm not going to get angry.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Before we start talking about things like taking parking, I'm just kidding. I'm very much in favor of the project overall. I'm also very much in favor of continuing it because there's way too much undecided right now. But I like the project. I, unlike the individual who said he moved here to get away from this kind of growth, my husband and I only left Chicago because of the growth that was happening here. I've lived in Arlington Heights, other than my short stint in Chicago, my entire life, so almost 47 years now. So, I think I out-resident most of you people around here.

So, I really like the project. I don't think the glass building looks like a hospital. I think it looks really cool, and I am excited about that kind of mix and how that's going to come into our town. I think it's a great add.

But here is the problem with the parking. You used to live here, but you don't live here now, right?

MR. FIRSEL: You're right.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: I have a general frustration with people who say there's not enough parking in this town, because as pointed out the parking garages have spaces. People aren't actually saying there's not enough parking; they're saying there's not enough convenient parking.

MR. FIRSEL: Bingo.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: They want to park right in front of where they want to go. You know, if you've lived anywhere else in any urban environment, you don't get to do that when you have this kind of urban feel and that's what we've created in Arlington Heights and that goes along with it. You want all the restaurants, bars, excitement, restaurants, so we're not going to build a park right in front of the shop. Just like the woman who suggested people move to Iowa, if you move to a more quiet town, you'll be able to get that kind of parking. That's not what we're going to have here.

But whether or not I agree with that or believe it, it is a common complaint from our residents, right? So, we have to consider it and address it.

MR. FIRSEL: No question.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: I think that it's similar to the, you know, you take your victim as you find it concept in the law. You've got, there's a lot of lawyers in the room. I know you didn't create the problem but the problem is here and you're never going to be able to convince the residents that are upset about parking that you didn't take spots away, okay, regardless of the terminology.

MR. FIRSEL: Right.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: So, it is something that has to be considered and addressed just because we have to think about our residents and the impact that this is having, even though the positives to what this will bring to our community are wonderful and we

APPROVED

want you here, right? But we need to have more discussions.

So, I had a question on how you're going to work this validation, because as soon as you told me, oh, you go in and you get a ticket and then you go into a shop and they press it and I get it for free, the first thing I thought of is great, I'll walk into a shop, get it validated and then I'll go to Peggy's, you know, and I'll come back four hours later. So, I mean, there's always a workaround around the validation. So, I just, you know, hey, as a resident, I don't really care because I'd be able to get the parking. How do you plan to work that? Is there going to be some sort of time limit? I mean, how are we doing that? Yes?

MR. ENRIGHT: If I could interrupt, Chairman? We need a motion to extend.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Oh, to extend.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: 11:00 o'clock?

COMMISSIONER DROST: 11:00 o'clock, yes. I'll make that motion.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Second.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Shall we go half an hour here?

CHAIRMAN ENNES: We're going to extend a half hour?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: To 11:30?

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay, all in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Any opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay.

MR. FIRSEL: First of all, to the extent if this is continued past this evening, we will certainly provide as much of a detailed written parking allocation study plan as we can do at this time.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Oh, for sure, yes.

MR. FIRSEL: We have hired Walker Parking who I think they were a consultant, were they a consultant on the Vail Street Garage? I think they've worked within the Village, Charles? I'm not sure.

MR. WITHERINGTON-PERKINS: We've hired Walker for a couple of things, depends which Walker, there's two Walkers.

MR. FIRSEL: Yes, that's true. This is Walker Consultants who, they're extremely good. They've been on retainer with us for months. But we will, you want to know I think the logistics of how the parking will work, and we will do our very best to provide that, to provide how we're going to handle the peak hours, and to provide the information that is requested.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Sure, and I don't expect you to be able to have an answer for us. I just, you're saying that, you know, this is only for our customers and we're going to, you know, restrict it to that. In other words, you're going to pay. I'm just pointing out that residents and other people will always find a way around that.

MR. FIRSEL: Well, there's a chance that if they go into a shop and ask for validation, there's nothing that says the shop won't pay for the parking. They're not going to give you a validation unless you both something.

APPROVED

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Maybe, maybe not.

MR. FIRSEL: Who knows?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: I mean, but if you put a coffee shop in that corner and I can very quickly pick up a cup of coffee and get by. Anyway, just pointing that out. Just something to think about because, you know, we're kind of fighting back and forth about whether or not the public should have access, and in my opinion the public is going to find out a way to have access to your parking spots.

MR. FIRSEL: We agree.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: So, then the question becomes, you know, there is not enough to accommodate everybody in that space. So, it's something you might have to work out on your own about how you're going to monitor that.

I was a little confused about, I know we've had all these various ratios and different ways for measuring parking, and then we showed a deficit. I know that you disagree with those analyses and I'm not going to pick one or the other. I just want to understand one concept.

The deficit, was that overall including commercial? I mean, we're saying that as is, if we go with this 1.5, there won't even be enough parking for the commercial units? Or are you saying no, that's just for the residential?

MR. HUBBARD: Again, that depends on how the parking is allocated.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Sure.

MR. HUBBARD: But as a combined shared, you know, Highland building garage, there would be a deficit with commercial or in combination with residential as well.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Okay, so it's an overall deficit, okay.

MR. HUBBARD: Right, and you can specify it between commercial and residential, but it depends how it's ultimately allocated to, you know, where that deficit falls.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Sure, and we don't have a set recommendation or set requirement of a certain number being available for commercial versus residential, correct?

MR. FIRSEL: Sure you do.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: We do?

MR. FIRSEL: Yes.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: We do. There are so many conditions; I might have missed that.

MR. FIRSEL: It's 395, your code requires 395.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: No, no, I understand what the code requires. I'm saying in the parking garage, are you mandating X number will always be available for commercial use?

MR. HUBBARD: There may be a condition, there's none yet.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Right, okay.

MR. HUBBARD: But again, we need to see the plan to make a condition.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Exactly, so that's what I'm getting at is there's nothing to stop you, and I'm not saying you're trying to pull a fast one, but there's nothing to stop you from saying that our tenants want more cars so we're going to take away from what was going to be available to the public and we're going to give those to our tenants now, if we don't have some restrictions built in to make sure of that. Because part of your argument is

APPROVED

we're providing more parking for the public versus this, it would be another word than taking, but versus, you know, the removal of the 22 spots that you disagree with the assessments, but the residents are saying, you're saying, well, we're giving you more than 22, right? If you shop in our stores, you eat in our restaurants, there's more than 22 that we're providing to you.

MR. FIRSEL: That's correct.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Right. So, what I'm saying is, but there's no way to make sure that you don't take those away later.

MR. FIRSEL: The code requires us to have a certain number of allocated parking for our retail office on a full-time basis which we will absolutely comply with no matter what.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: I'd still feel better if it was a condition. People violate codes in this Village all the time. They come before us quite frequently.

MR. FIRSEL: Well, I think the last condition was that we comply with all of your --

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Right, right. It's on every single solitary one of them. I'm just saying that I would feel more comfortable if everyone had kind of an agreement on where we're at.

Then the last comment before I let George, because he's been chomping at the bit to take over here, you already tried to take away from me once, I'm just saying, George, back off.

COMMISSIONER DROST: I always like to take away from you.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Still my microphone. You made some comment about saving six spaces so that we could, in getting rid of the, you see it's 11:00 o'clock, it's been a long day.

MR. FIRSEL: The loading zone, yes.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: The loading zone, right, whether or not I haven't fully fleshed out because we really don't have enough time to get into it and I know you guys are going to work on that if we continue, whether or not I think that's good or bad, but you did make a mention of we'll reduce the buffers and save two spots. I just wanted to point out I would much rather lose two spots if we're going to keep the loading zone instead of having to park my car somewhere that might get hit by like a truck. It's two spots. So, just my, I would rather lose those spots is all I'm saying, okay?

MR. FIRSEL: We can accommodate both. We can keep the loading zones as they are. The width of those walls on the side simply don't have to be nearly as wide as they are and we could add one parking spot on each side, and keep the loading zone as it is.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Okay, and the loading zone sounds like a good --

MR. FIRSEL: We will present that when we respond to our third round of comments. We will respond with that as well as a more in-depth parking analysis for our, and it will be both garages because there will be some, as I said to Commissioner Sigalos, there may be certain situations where we may have to put some of the parking in the excess spots in the Chestnut building. How that will be regulated, we will cover that.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Great, and again, I'm very much in favor and hope to see this project come about. There's just some tweaking that still needs to be done.

MR. FIRSEL: I think that's what it's down to.

APPROVED

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: I'm really just commenting, I mean, really these comments to me are just kind of tweaking, right, not overall overhauls or anything in my opinion. I'm only one Commissioner. I think it's great. I think it's going to be a terrific benefit. But I do appreciate what Staff is saying is this is going to be a major change to our downtown the way it currently exists. There are some considerations and we need more time to make sure it's being planned out carefully. So, I am in favor of the continuance. That's it.

COMMISSIONER DROST: This is the Lincoln Yards of Arlington Heights.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: The Lincoln Yards?

COMMISSIONER DROST: This is not --

MR. FIRSEL: Great analogy.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes. No, so, I'll just try to keep it in some broad strokes. One issue that I've got is sort of in the technology end of it. As we, and being an older guy maybe and remembering when there were smoking cars on the Metra, what about power? The charging station for electric cars, if there are smaller, urban, you know, cars? Is there going to be some adaptability built into it? Maybe it's more of a construction question. Then leading into the construction question, I'll just ask the questions and then you can answer if you feel comfortable with them.

MR. FIRSEL: Sure.

COMMISSIONER DROST: The type of construction, will it be the New Green Deal type construction, LEED certified, and all of those factors of sort of a modern building? You're going to be building luxury apartments or luxury units.

A third issue is with the rental mix, because there's a predominant studio/one-bedroom bias to the mix. If the parking didn't work out and you had a deficiency, a significant deficiency, can you repurpose some of the studio and one-bedroom making them larger? Or at some point even doing condominium conversions for certain parts of the development? That's sort of a general question.

I think, and the setback question, does that make any sense? The first speaker, Judy, I don't think that was addressed. Maybe we did argue about congestion and parking, I forgot about that. No, I'm teasing. That was I know the central one and you guys will figure that out.

Then I think the other thing that we need to know is something about the developer. Has the developer ever built anything in Arlington Heights or anywhere in the northwest communities?

MR. FIRSEL: I'm so glad you asked that question.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Has he had experience in building? Does he know what he's doing? You know, I think we need that for the record.

MR. ADREANI: You want me to answer that?

COMMISSIONER DROST: I've got a tongue-in-cheek on that one, but I think there's experience, and then what have you learned from those other experiences you've had in building canyons in Des Plaines and elsewhere? That you know about aesthetics and you've kind of --

MR. ADREANI: Good evening. Once again, Bruce Adreani here.

COMMISSIONER DROST: You can start with the last one, too.

MR. ADREANI: Actually, I'll go through the list that you talked about. Car charging, yes, we will. My wife and I, we also have an apartment in Florida and we just got

APPROVED

through putting two chargers inside our building. They're in a couple of strategic locations and it works out well. We've just got to find people that will, you know, not over-time themselves for those stations, because some people do stay there and they forget that they're plugged in. So, they've got to go back on that and look at it.

LEED, yes, we have talked about, looked into, and we will be doing some LEED programs here on our buildings.

The rental mix, we will have people reviewing, all of our people, to find out what type of units are going to be selling well, I mean, I'm sorry, leasing well, and whether or not this particular apartment building can be converted to condominiums down the road, I think we have it in our ordinance or will be in our conditions that we'll have to come back and talk to you regarding that, and that particular approval will not be unreasonably worked out, is that correct?

MR. WITHERINGTON-PERKINS: The main issue is parking because condos have typically a higher parking. So, we're not worried about the Chestnut building, it's more the Highland and Campbell buildings.

MR. ADREANI: Right, and they may be re-mixed also. You know, you may take two studios and make one particular larger unit out of it. So, I think that would work well. We wouldn't want to do anything to jeopardize our sales should a condominium conversion falls through.

Regarding the setback, it is what it is. There's a lot of buildings here --

MR. FIRSEL: The lady brought up the issue about the setback on Campbell. There is no variation.

COMMISSIONER DROST: And that was a complaint, and that goes really to sort of the construction materials that you use. Do you have sound-absorbing materials so they don't ricochet off of windows? Ambient light and ambient noise issues, those kinds of --

MR. ADREANI: It's hard to do that. It's brick, glass, it's hard to do that.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, but you've got a smart contractor.

MR. FIRSEL: The smartest.

MR. ADREANI: And that brings me to the fifth question that you had. Yes, I've been at this business since I was 15 working for my dad. We have built in the northwest suburbs. I did a lot of work in town here back in the early to mid 70's on different buildings that he was involved with. I've done a lot of buildings that have been in projects, I shouldn't say projects, but in areas like this particular setting where there have been TOD development types, where people can just walk to everything. To have a full train, that would be great. You know, to get some other cars as we can from Metra, that would be great.

So, I look forward to that happening, and that would also lessen the parking that we'll require of everybody, because I strongly feel that this particular development will not fill up the parking spaces. That's what, you know, I've been doing this all my life. I just didn't start yesterday, and I just have a lot of faith in that, knowing the marketplace, where the people would be coming from, where they're going to. I want to be a part of this just like you folks do, you folks up there and everybody else in the audience, too, and I take great pride in what I do. So, I will deliver.

MR. FIRSEL: One of the things that we did discuss early on, and we're not ruling it out, because of the transient nature of the, not the apartments but the use of

APPROVED

automobiles and Metra, is possibly putting a small Zip car concession in the lower level of the garage so people don't need to have a car full time. They don't have to pay for it. There will be four or five down there. You take a car when you need it, you pay for it, and you return it. What could be an easier solution than that? So, we are considering that.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Those are sort of the ideas of staying ahead of it, and I'm not the guy that is the technology --

MR. FIRSEL: Yes, we are considering that.

COMMISSIONER DROST: But Zip cars, the Ubers, artificial intelligence where you can, you know, get the app to have the car deliver your --

MR. FIRSEL: Before you know it, you will be in your apartment and you will press a button and your Tesla will pull out of its own parking space and pick you up in the loading zone.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: I like that.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, yes. I'm done, go ahead. Go ahead.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: I think every question that could be asked has been asked and answered as far as I'm concerned. So, I'm very happy, I like this project, and I think you've, I think both you and the Staff are to be commended. The reports were great. You've gone through all the issues. It's too bad that some of the people who asked these questions left before you got a chance to answer them.

But I still, like Commissioner Dawson, am probably going to want to support a continuance so you can work all those things out, which means you're going to have to come back and talk to us again I guess.

MR. FIRSEL: It would be a pleasure.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Okay, well, if you've done your homework, you know I'm the environmental person on this Commission, and I do want to thank you very much for the green roofs. I think they do add a significant benefit to the environment and to your residents.

The only question I had was there was some talk about permeable pavers but now there's talk about fire trucks, so I got lost as to what the current status of the permeable pavers are.

MR. FIRSEL: That's a very, very good question. It's not meant to be a sarcastic answer, it's so are we. We have, we believe, and we will clarify this because this was brought up in the recent round of comments. The comments, thank goodness, on both ends are shrinking, and these were a couple of the comments we just received. The departments may conflict in their responses between Engineering, Fire Safety, Fire Department. We will comply with whatever is required to comply.

We do know that there are, I believe your new police station or one of the other newer buildings?

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Yes, behind the police station.

MR. FIRSEL: Behind the police station is what we want to put in that area, okay. But we will examine that further and we will confirm it with Staff and the various departments, so when we come back, we will hopefully have a concrete resolution of that.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: No pun intended there?

MR. FIRSEL: That was said on purpose. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Thanks, that's it.

APPROVED

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Okay, so I come from the south side of town, so every time I come downtown I actually like those spots that are going away. But I wanted to thank you, after your explanation, I want to thank you for all that free parking all these years.

So, a question for Staff. Mr. Firsel said they're providing more spots than needed. Do you not agree with his statement?

MR. HUBBARD: From a code standpoint, they are. From the data that they provided in their parking study, there is going to be a deficit at certain times.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Okay, that's good enough. The five full-time employees that Ms. Smart talked about, that's not mandated anywhere, is it? I mean, they could go down to three or up to six?

MR. HUBBARD: It's not a code requirement.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: No guarantee, right, okay. The R-3 lot, where is the R-3 lot that's got to be rezoned?

MR. HUBBARD: The R-3 lots are this lot, this lot, this lot and that lot.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Okay, thank you. Let's see. The southwest corner of Chestnut and Campbell is where they're going to be doing some staging for the contractor. Who owns that lot?

MR. FIRSEL: We do. Mr. Adreani does.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Wait, what lot?

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: There's an empty, there's a lot on the southwest corner.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Oh, the parking lot?

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: That their contractor is going to be parking.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Those are parking spots, right? Okay.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Another question, the dog walk area within the compound, where is that going to be at?

MR. FIRSEL: It's shown in one of the plans.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Right there, okay.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, that was actually another question I had. What happens to the loss of the current dog walkers? Where do they go?

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Wherever they want.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Quick question for KLOA. The traffic study or the traffic counts you did, does that take into, do you do it different if you take into account a transit-oriented development?

MR. ABOONA: I'm sorry? I don't --

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: The traffic counts that you did or projections, is it different if you're out in the middle of nowhere as opposed to maybe a TOD area?

MR. ABOONA: Yes, I mean, we took, in the trip generation we took that into account. We assumed a 15 percent reduction to account for some of the residents that may not drive and take the train, yes.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Okay, thank you. Is there any component to a noise study on a development like this?

MR. WITHERINGTON-PERKINS: No, not typically.

APPROVED

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Okay, that's not required. Final question for the Staff, so there's talk about, some talk about density and the statements made that this is a lot less dense than what could be allowed. Just give me a quick example, what could go up instead of what's going up now as far as --

MR. HUBBARD: They're pretty much maxed out from a code standpoint when it comes to density.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Pardon me?

MR. HUBBARD: They're pretty much at the max density allowed by the zoning district.

MR. FIRSEL: Could you put your matrix up? The matrix that has the density.

MR. HUBBARD: Yes, I don't have it, but they're pretty much maxed out.

MR. FIRSEL: Yes.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Okay, that's all I have, thank you.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Commissioner Green?

COMMISSIONER GREEN: I can't possibly think of anything else to ask you, but I do want --

CHAIRMAN ENNES: But you will.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Just a couple of quick items. This is for Staff. When you figure out the parking and you get your final study, if those were to become condo buildings along Chestnut, would that change the requirement, the number of spots versus rental?

MR. HUBBARD: The code requirement is the same. The actual demand is sometimes greater for a condo development.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Okay, just so you don't have to do this again, if that's a consideration, consider it.

MR. FIRSEL: I think that's a great point.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Just so you don't have to come back and do it again. So, other than that, I just wanted to say I like the project. I think it's great. I've liked it from the old Conceptual Plan Review Committee. I think it's good. I was giving the Design Commission a hard time for the appearance of the Chestnut building. I think that going through the Design Commission three times, it is a huge improvement. I like it. I like the fact that I was questioning the commercial on the first floor, I don't question that any more, I think it's a good fit. Good project.

MR. FIRSEL: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: That's from our architect.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: I'm done. My voice is done, too.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: There's a lot of voices going. Anyways, I have a couple of brief questions.

MR. FIRSEL: Sure.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Mr. Adreani, rumor has it you grew up in Niles?

MR. ADREANI: No.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: No?

MR. ADREANI: I did live there for a while, my wife and I.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Yes, me, too, around the same time. You know, we'll

APPROVED

talk later.

MR. ADREANI: And my brother lived there, too.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Yes, okay. To piggyback on Joe's comment about Deb Smart, she talked about how you're going to be setting this up to get going and acclimate. She had quite a list of things that you'll be doing there and I just want to confirm. It's not just the one issue about the number of employees, these are all conditional things. You're going to be running a business, you'll do what works for you, right? These are not things that are written in stone that are going to be part of this project going on. You'll have to see what works.

MR. FIRSEL: It could be more, it could be less as we, it depends on circumstances which as we all know vary day to day, week to week. The goal is to adapt and do what's best for the Village and best for our tenants.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Right, okay. Let's see. For KLOA, I had a couple of quick questions here. These loading spots in your courtyard here, what's the biggest size truck that will fit in those, in the courtyard?

MR. ABOONA: They're mostly, they're all single unit panel truck.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: But what length of a truck? Are these for --

MR. ABOONA: Thirty feet. They're single unit, they're not tractor trailers.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay, but, so for trucks that are going to be supplying your businesses that might be delivering household goods to your tenants and that type of stuff.

MR. ABOONA: That's correct, and we've already, we also tested it to accommodate emergency fire trucks being able to maneuver through the motor court.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: I think this is a wonderful feature to have these internal so they're off the street.

MR. ABOONA: Absolutely.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Which is a constant complaint of the neighbors. So, you might be losing some parking spots, but they're not going to have trucks out there either.

MR. ABOONA: Absolutely.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: If we're removing some of the parking spots on Campbell, why on both sides of the street?

MR. HUBBARD: When you put a crosswalk on the other, the east leg of Campbell and Highland and the bump-out for that crosswalk, it eliminates two spaces. So, I can show you if you --

CHAIRMAN ENNES: So, there's still going to be like three?

MR. HUBBARD: Right, there's one space here, there's one space here, and there's one space here. Once you put a crosswalk here and a bump-out for that crosswalk, it's going to eliminate two out of these three spaces.

MR. FIRSEL: Neither of which is at or on our property.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Yes, well, would you mind it being on your property? It would take less spaces off the street there if we --

COMMISSIONER GREEN: If we put the crosswalk just on the east side of Highland.

MR. FIRSEL: It is on the east side.

MR. ADREANI: But then it goes across to where the fire hydrant is. There's no parking there.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: We've only got three minutes until we have

APPROVED

to extend again.

MR. HUBBARD: Based on the design, it's going to eliminate two spaces.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay, you know, just in summary, I think it's a fantastic project. Long, long overdue. It's a shame the Village has missed all the revenue from a development like this for so long. I realize it takes an awful long time to assemble a property like this, pick up all those residential lots and amass something like this and get the plans together. I love it, I think it's going to be a fantastic addition to downtown.

It's nice to know that there's a lot of the neighbors who strongly support it. I just can't say enough about it, although with 10 conditions, 10 of the Village Staff's conditions that you're either no or would need to look in more, I have to really agree with the continuance. I hate to put you guys off because I know time is money. You've got a lot of money invested in this already and I know you'd like to get going. But hopefully, you can put that together, what they need, and get back to us because --

MR. FIRSEL: As long as Staff isn't -- I'm sorry, I didn't mean to interrupt.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: No, go ahead.

MR. FIRSEL: As long as Staff isn't tired of seeing us and going through these. It is our intention, when I get back from my vacation I'm taking tomorrow which I need after this, to sit down with the Staff, go over the conditions, go over the remaining comments, and come as close to resolution on as many of them as we possibly can so that when we do come back, that 10 may be down to a much lower number by us changing or maybe the Staff changing a little bit. But that's how we've been able to work in the past and hopefully we'll be able to do so. So, next meeting, we will make much it shorter.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Well, yes, I hope for that. But yes, good luck with that. I don't think they're tired of seeing you or they wouldn't have put so many conditions in there.

MR. FIRSEL: Oh, they're not done yet.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Yes. But no, good luck with it. Do we have a motion?

COMMISSIONER DROST: I'll make a motion to continue the hearing based on what we discussed here as far as the open-ended items related generally to the parking issue. I did want to also make a comment to our audience, both pro and con in concerns. I think it was a very civil hearing and I appreciate the fact that people could hear and listen to each other. That's the motion with a comment.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: I'll second it.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: And there's a second.

MR. HUBBARD: Is the motion to continue until the April 24th meeting?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Sure.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay, continue.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: To the April 24th meeting.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Do you want to take roll call?

MR. FIRSEL: Excuse me. When would it be continued to and come to the next meeting?

MR. HUBBARD: To the April 24th meeting is what we'd recommend.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Is what?

MR. HUBBARD: Is what Staff would recommend.

APPROVED

MR. FIRSEL: We would strongly request the April 10th meeting.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Well, you've got a study that comes in when?
It's April 19th or something?

MR. ENRIGHT: No, that's not a study. That's just an RFP for how much it's going to cost.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay, well, as soon as --

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Work it out with Staff.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: We're just making a motion to continue to the next available date, how about that? And you guys can figure the date, does that work?

MR. WITHERINGTON-PERKINS: I think for our public notice, you have to have a specific date.

MR. FIRSEL: We have to re-notice?

MR. WITHERINGTON-PERKINS: Otherwise you have to do notice again.
So, there needs to be a specific date in the motion.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: So, what are your thoughts about the 10th?

MR. WITHERINGTON-PERKINS: Well, a report would have to go out next week. We haven't met and we haven't received anything. So, that's the issue with the 10th.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: As soon as you can meet with them.

MR. WITHERINGTON-PERKINS: Well, I mean, you can continue to the 10th, and if we have information, you know, by the end of the week and we can meet early next week, then we can make it, great. If not, there would be a simple motion to continue at the 10th to the 24th.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: As long as we can get --

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Yes.

MR. FIRSEL: May we request that? We'll do our very best.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Add that.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Okay, yes.

COMMISSIONER DROST: 10th to the 24th. So, 10th.

MR. WITHERINGTON-PERKINS: So, make a motion tonight to continue to April 10th if that's the will of the Commission.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Yes.

MR. WITHERINGTON-PERKINS: And then on the 10th, we'll know the week before where we're at.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Charles, the 30-day public notice posting doesn't pertain because it's being continued?

MR. HUBBARD: To a date specific, it doesn't pertain here.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay. Yes, we need a roll call, a vote.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Cherwin.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Drost.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Aye.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Green.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Jensen.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Yes.

APPROVED

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Lorenzini.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Sigalos.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Warskow.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Chairman Ennes.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Yes.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: And I'm right here. Come on, it was like two minutes late people.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Dawson.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Here.

MR. FIRSEL: So, I can tell my partners we had a unanimous vote tonight. Thank you all.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Yes.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: You did.

MR. FIRSEL: Thank you so much for your time and staying to this late hour. We truly appreciate it. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Thanks for all your hard work on this project.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Do I make a motion to adjourn?

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: But we need to make a motion to adjourn.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: No, we have to adjourn.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: I need a motion to adjourn.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: I make a motion to adjourn.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Second.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: All in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Any opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay, we're done.


(Whereupon, the public hearing on the above-mentioned petition was adjourned at 11:33 p.m.)


STATE OF ILLINOIS)
) SS.
 COUNTY OF COOK)

I, RONALD LeGRAND, SR., depose and
 say that I am a digital court reporter doing business in the State of Illinois;
 that I reported verbatim the foregoing proceedings and that the foregoing
 is a true and correct transcript to the best of my knowledge and ability.


 RONALD LeGRAND, SR.

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN TO
 BEFORE ME THIS 5TH DAY OF
April, A.D. 2019.


 NOTARY PUBLIC



LeGRAND REPORTING & VIDEO SERVICES
 Chicago & Roselle, Illinois - Miami & Orlando, Florida
 (630) 894-9389 - (800) 219-1212

30,323 SQ. FT.

13,113 SQ. FT.

ARLINGTON 425: 44 S. HIGHLAND BUILDING FLOOR PLANS

SCALE: 1" = 20'-0"

30,323 SQ. FT.

30,323 SQ. FT.

 OFFICE
  RESIDENT GUEST

 RESTAURANT / RETAIL
  RESTRICTED RESIDENTIAL

TINAGLIA ARCHITECTS • INC
814 W. NORTHWEST HIGHWAY
ARLINGTON HEIGHTS • IL 60004
VOICE • 847 253 0002
DATA • 847 253 3063
www.tinaglia.com

TINAGLIA
ARCHITECTS

CLIENT

CCH LLC
838 BUSSE HIGHWAY
PARK RIDGE, IL 60068

PROJECT

ARLINGTON 425

ARLINGTON HEIGHTS, IL 60005
MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT

DRAWING TITLE

HIGHLAND BLDG. FLOOR PLANS

FILE NAME 3883-27P

FILE NAME 3883-27P
DRAWN BY RDL DATE 11.13.18

NO.	REVISED PER	DATE	BY
2	DESIGN DEVELOPMENT	11.27.18	RDL
4	PRELIM D.C. MEETING	12.17.18	RDL
6	DC & PC SUBMITTALS	1.14.19	RDL
7	REVISED PC SUBMITTAL	2.18.19	RDL
8	REVISED DC SUBMITTAL	3.1.19	RDL
9	REVISED PC SUBMITTAL	3.15.19	RDL
11	REVISED PC SUBMITTAL	4.9.19	RDL


JOB NO. 388315

SHEET NO.
OF 13

HL.1


PROFESSIONAL DESIGN FIRM LICENSE #184-002934

© COPYRIGHT 2019 TINAGLIA ARCHITECTS, INC.



TYPICAL 7th THROUGH 12th LEVEL RESIDENTIAL FLOOR PLAN

19,485 SQ. FT.




6th LEVEL PARKING GARAGE PLAN

30,323 SQ. FT.


ARLINGTON 425: 44 S. HIGHLAND BUILDING FLOOR PLANS

SCALE: 1" = 20'-0"

- OFFICE
- RESTAURANT / RETAIL
- RESIDENT GUEST
- RESTRICTED RESIDENTIAL



ROOF PLAN



AMENITY / ROOF TERRACE LEVEL FLOOR PLAN

12,844 SQ. FT.

TINAGLIA ARCHITECTS • INC
814 W. NORTHWEST HIGHWAY
ARLINGTON HEIGHTS • IL 60004
VOICE • 847 253 0002
DATA • 847 253 3063
www.tinaglia.com

TINAGLIA

CLIENT

CCH LLC
838 BUSSE HIGHWAY
PARK RIDGE, IL 60068

PROJECT

ARLINGTON 425
ARLINGTON HEIGHTS, IL 60005
MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT

DRAWING TITLE

HIGHLAND BLDG.
FLOOR PLANS

FILE NAME	3883-27P	DATE	11.13.18
DRAWN BY	RDL	DATE	11.13.18
NO.	REVISED PER	DATE	BY
2	DESIGN DEVELOPMENT	11.27.18	RDL
4	PRELIM D.C. MEETING	12.17.18	RDL
6	DC & PC SUBMITTALS	1.14.19	RDL
7	REVISED PC SUBMITTAL	2.18.19	RDL
8	REVISED DC SUBMITTAL	3.1.19	RDL
9	REVISED PC SUBMITTAL	3.15.19	RDL
10	REVISED PC SUBMITTAL	4.2.19	RDL

JOB NO. 388315

SHEET NO.
OF 13

HL.2

© COPYRIGHT 2019 TINAGLIA ARCHITECTS, INC.

PROFESSIONAL DESIGN FIRM LICENSE #184-002934

Briarwood Management LLC

April 9, 2019

Charles Perkins

Planning & Community Development

Village of Arlington Heights

Enclosed for your review is our current assessment of the parking plan for Arlington 425. This plan grants us great flexibility to adjust dedicated parking counts as the nature of parking requirements evolve. This plan contains the following components:

- Increased on site parking by an additional 21 parking spaces with the relocation of 44 parking stalls from removed Chestnut/courtyard underground to the Highland structure
- Provided detailed assignment of parking spaces by user
- Operational Plan for the Garage

Increased On- Site Parking

The revised drawings which are included have increased the property's parking by 21 stalls for a total of 565 stalls. The redesign has extended the flexibility of usage in the main Highland structure by 47 stalls. This allows us to manage the parking operation based on actual usage. The redesign is also in full compliance with ADA (Americans with Disabilities Act) requirements and the new placement of these spaces provides easier access for our customer and/or visitors. Various access points have been included in the plan to control access to specific parking areas-based customer type.

Assignment of Parking Stalls

Lower Level

The lower level will have 66 dedicated stalls for the office, retail and restaurant operations. This area will also be used by the restaurant valet. This floor will also contain all employee parking for retail and restaurant. It will be controlled by a fob/ticket system.

Ground Level

This level will be dedicated to the restaurant and retail customers. This will also have a small section that can be used by the restaurant valet as overflow. This floor will be controlled via validated parking or fob. This floor has a total of 24 stalls.

Second Level

This floor will have a mixed use. The east side of garage will have 44 stalls for office customers and/or retail/restaurant. These stalls will be validated and fob parking.

The west side of this floor 30 stalls utilized unreserved guest parking, mixed use parking for resident (second car) and possible shared office parking. This are will also contain 4 handicap parking stalls. It will be controlled by validated parking and/or fob depending on the assignment.

We will have a total of 160 non-residential parking spaces.

Floors 3-6

These floors will be primarily dedicated to resident parking and will contain a total of 347 stalls. The entry and exit will be controlled by a fob system. Space control will be part of the integrated marketing plan with potential residents.

A handicap resident can have an option of using a lower level designated handicap spot for higher van height or a passenger vehicle can request reallocation of a spot to the assigned resident areas. If that occurs that spot will be posted reserved for that resident.

Operation Plan

All floors will be clearly identified as to their use. Colored maps will also be mounted to insure residents, guests, customers and staff are fully aware of dedicated parking areas. Designed resident, staff, office and retail staff will have fob access. Our preliminary monthly parking will be charged at the rate of \$50.00 subject to market conditions. Some retail and office spaces may have stalls assigned based on lease agreements. Employee parking will be determined on village employee rates.

Parking will be a portion of property staff responsibilities and they will be available to manage traffic flow and volumes.

We are currently evaluating the specifics on the fob entry system and garage staffing software, hardware and staffing hours are all being taken into consideration.

Visitors who choose to park in our facility will receive a parking ticket which charges \$2.00 for 4 hour minimum \$1.00 for each additional hour or portion thereof. We are discussing opportunities to allow limited parking arrangements with local businesses.

Chestnut

This structure will now have 58 dedicated stalls to the residents. These will be contained in the building's underground garage.

Conclusion

This is a comprehensive robust plan that addresses the needs of this project. It takes into account all aspects of the parking population for our project. Spaces and floors will be clearly as to their intended use.

Thank you for your consideration.

Debbie Smart
Manager of Resident Services
Briarwood Management
151 West Wing Street
Arlington Heights, Illinois 60005
773-367-2380

Arlington 425

Weekday Parking Demand - ITE/ULI and Modified Village Code

Time	Retail	Restaurant	Office	Residential	Residential (Chestnut Overflow)	Total Required	Surplus/ Deficit	Commercial Total
6:00 AM	0	22	0	399	12	433	74	22
7:00 AM	2	37	9	359	11	418	89	48
8:00 AM	6	48	13	339	10	416	91	67
9:00 AM	13	65	15	319	10	422	85	93
10:00 AM	22	72	16	299	9	418	89	110
11:00 AM	30	78	16	279	8	412	95	124
12:00 PM	33	85	14	259	8	399	108	132
1:00 PM	32	77	12	279	8	409	98	121
2:00 PM	31	45	13	279	8	377	130	89
3:00 PM	29	36	13	279	8	366	141	78
4:00 PM	26	36	12	299	9	382	125	74
5:00 PM	20	65	7	339	10	441	66	92
6:00 PM	21	71	4	359	11	466	41	96
7:00 PM	25	54	0	387	12	478	29	79
8:00 PM	23	56	0	391	12	482	25	79
9:00 PM	0	54	0	395	12	461	46	54
10:00 PM	0	41	0	399	12	452	55	41
Method:	ITE/ULI	ITE/ULI	ITE/ULI	1.3 Sp./Unit*	1.3 Sp./Unit*	-	-	ITE/ULI
	Total Parking Provided:			507 Spaces				
*1.3 spaces per unit, multiplied by the ULI Recommended Time-of-Day Factors for Weekdays - Residential (Resident) factors 307 Proposed Units (Campbell Building and Highland Building) - 12 Overflow Spaces from Chestnut Building								

ULI Recommended Time-of-Day Factors for Weekdays	
<i>Time</i>	<i>Factor</i>
6:00 AM	100%
7:00 AM	90%
8:00 AM	85%
9:00 AM	80%
10:00 AM	75%
11:00 AM	70%
12:00 PM	65%
1:00 PM	70%
2:00 PM	70%
3:00 PM	70%
4:00 PM	75%
5:00 PM	85%
6:00 PM	90%
7:00 PM	97%
8:00 PM	98%
9:00 PM	99%
10:00 PM	100%

Arlington 425

Weekday Parking Demand - ITE/ULI and Modified Village Code

Time	Retail	Restaurant	Office	Residential	Residential (Chestnut Overflow)	Total Required	Surplus/ Deficit	Commercial Total
6:00 AM	0	22	0	461	23	506	1	22
7:00 AM	2	37	9	415	21	484	23	48
8:00 AM	6	48	13	392	20	478	29	67
9:00 AM	13	65	15	369	18	480	27	93
10:00 AM	22	72	16	346	17	473	34	110
11:00 AM	30	78	16	323	16	463	44	124
12:00 PM	33	85	14	300	15	447	60	132
1:00 PM	32	77	12	323	16	460	47	121
2:00 PM	31	45	13	323	16	428	79	89
3:00 PM	29	36	13	323	16	417	90	78
4:00 PM	26	36	12	346	17	437	70	74
5:00 PM	20	65	7	392	20	503	4	92
6:00 PM	21	71	4	415	21	532	-25	96
7:00 PM	25	54	0	447	22	548	-41	79
8:00 PM	23	56	0	452	23	553	-46	79
9:00 PM	0	54	0	456	23	533	-26	54
10:00 PM	0	41	0	461	23	525	-18	41
Method:	ITE/ULI	ITE/ULI	ITE/ULI	1.5 Sp./Unit*	1.5 Sp./Unit*	-	-	ITE/ULI
	Total Parking Provided:			507 Spaces				
*1.5 spaces per unit, multiplied by the ULI Recommended Time-of-Day Factors for Weekdays - Residential (Resident) factors 307 Proposed Units (Campbell Building and Highland Building) - 23 Overflow Spaces from Chestnut Building								

ULI Recommended Time-of-Day Factors for Weekdays	
<i>Time</i>	<i>Factor</i>
6:00 AM	100%
7:00 AM	90%
8:00 AM	85%
9:00 AM	80%
10:00 AM	75%
11:00 AM	70%
12:00 PM	65%
1:00 PM	70%
2:00 PM	70%
3:00 PM	70%
4:00 PM	75%
5:00 PM	85%
6:00 PM	90%
7:00 PM	97%
8:00 PM	98%
9:00 PM	99%
10:00 PM	100%

Arlington 425

Weekend Parking Demand - ITE/ULI and Modified Village Code

Time	Retail	Restaurant	Office	Residential	Residential (Chestnut Overflow)	Total Required	Surplus/ Deficit	Commercial Total
6:00 AM	0	22	0	399	12	433	74	22
7:00 AM	5	32	3	359	11	410	97	40
8:00 AM	10	55	10	339	10	424	83	75
9:00 AM	22	79	13	319	10	443	64	114
10:00 AM	28	102	14	299	9	452	55	144
11:00 AM	33	108	16	279	8	445	62	157
12:00 PM	37	100	14	259	8	418	89	151
1:00 PM	37	91	13	279	8	429	78	141
2:00 PM	36	68	10	279	8	402	105	114
3:00 PM	34	42	6	279	8	370	137	82
4:00 PM	28	52	3	299	9	391	116	83
5:00 PM	25	59	2	339	10	435	72	86
6:00 PM	27	68	1	359	11	466	41	96
7:00 PM	19	80	0	387	12	498	9	99
8:00 PM	19	59	0	391	12	481	26	78
9:00 PM	0	42	0	395	12	449	58	42
10:00 PM	0	43	0	399	12	454	53	43
Method:	ITE/ULI	ITE/ULI	ITE/ULI	1.3 Sp./Unit*	1.3 Sp./Unit*	-	-	ITE/ULI
	Total Parking Provided:			507 Spaces				
*1.3 spaces per unit, multiplied by the ULI Recommended Time-of-Day Factors for Weekdays - Residential (Resident) factors 307 Proposed Units (Campbell Building and Highland Building) - 12 Overflow Spaces from Chestnut Building								

ULI Recommended Time-of-Day Factors for Weekends	
<i>Time</i>	<i>Factor</i>
6:00 AM	100%
7:00 AM	90%
8:00 AM	85%
9:00 AM	80%
10:00 AM	75%
11:00 AM	70%
12:00 PM	65%
1:00 PM	70%
2:00 PM	70%
3:00 PM	70%
4:00 PM	75%
5:00 PM	85%
6:00 PM	90%
7:00 PM	97%
8:00 PM	98%
9:00 PM	99%
10:00 PM	100%

Arlington 425


Weekend Parking Demand - ITE/ULI and Modified Village Code

Time	Retail	Restaurant	Office	Residential	Residential (Chestnut Overflow)	Total Required	Surplus/ Deficit	Commercial Total
6:00 AM	0	22	0	461	23	506	1	22
7:00 AM	5	32	3	415	21	476	31	40
8:00 AM	10	55	10	392	20	486	21	75
9:00 AM	22	79	13	369	18	501	6	114
10:00 AM	28	102	14	346	17	507	0	144
11:00 AM	33	108	16	323	16	496	11	157
12:00 PM	37	100	14	300	15	466	41	151
1:00 PM	37	91	13	323	16	480	27	141
2:00 PM	36	68	10	323	16	453	54	114
3:00 PM	34	42	6	323	16	421	86	82
4:00 PM	28	52	3	346	17	446	61	83
5:00 PM	25	59	2	392	20	497	10	86
6:00 PM	27	68	1	415	21	532	-25	96
7:00 PM	19	80	0	447	22	568	-61	99
8:00 PM	19	59	0	452	23	552	-45	78
9:00 PM	0	42	0	456	23	521	-14	42
10:00 PM	0	43	0	461	23	527	-20	43
Method:	ITE/ULI	ITE/ULI	ITE/ULI	1.5 Sp./Unit*	1.5 Sp./Unit*	-	-	ITE/ULI
	Total Parking Provided:			507 Spaces				
*1.5 spaces per unit, multiplied by the ULI Recommended Time-of-Day Factors for Weekdays - Residential (Resident) factors 307 Proposed Units (Campbell Building and Highland Building) - 23 Overflow Spaces from Chestnut Building								

ULI Recommended Time-of-Day Factors for Weekends	
<i>Time</i>	<i>Factor</i>
6:00 AM	100%
7:00 AM	90%
8:00 AM	85%
9:00 AM	80%
10:00 AM	75%
11:00 AM	70%
12:00 PM	65%
1:00 PM	70%
2:00 PM	70%
3:00 PM	70%
4:00 PM	75%
5:00 PM	85%
6:00 PM	90%
7:00 PM	97%
8:00 PM	98%
9:00 PM	99%
10:00 PM	100%

Arlington 425 Parking Space Allocation

<i>Dedicated Use</i>	<i>Color on Plan</i>	<i>Spaces</i>
Commercial	Blue	134
Residential	Green	335
Residential Guests/Chestnut Building Overflow	Salmon	38
<i>Total Number of Spaces: 507</i>		



ARLINGTON 425: ARCHITECTURAL SITE PLAN

SCALE: 1" = 30'-0"

ARLINGTON 425

A NEW B-5 DISTRICT PUD DEVELOPMENT PRESENTED BY:
CCH LLC * 838 BUSSE HIGHWAY * PARK RIDGE, ILLINOIS

DRAWING INDEX

CS	COVER SHEET AND ARCHITECTURAL SITE PLAN
CP.1	CONTEXTUAL SITE PLAN
HL.1	44 S. HIGHLAND BUILDING FLOOR PLANS
HL.2	44 S. HIGHLAND BUILDING FLOOR PLANS
HL.3	44 S. HIGHLAND BUILDING ELEVATIONS
HL.4	44 S. HIGHLAND BUILDING ELEVATIONS
HL.5	44 S. HIGHLAND BUILDING SECTIONS
CA.1	225 W. CAMPBELL BUILDING FLOOR PLANS
CA.2	225 W. CAMPBELL BUILDING FLOOR PLANS
CA.3	225 W. CAMPBELL BUILDING ELEVATIONS
CA.4	225 W. CAMPBELL BUILDING ELEVATIONS
CH.1	33 S. CHESTNUT BUILDING FLOOR PLANS
CH.2	33 S. CHESTNUT BUILDING ELEVATIONS

© COPYRIGHT 2019 TINAGLIA ARCHITECTS, INC.

TINAGLIA ARCHITECTS, INC.
814 W. NORTHWEST HIGHWAY
ARLINGTON HEIGHTS-IL 60004
VOICE • 847 253 0002
DATA • 847 253 3063
www.tinaglia.com

TINAGLIA
ARCHITECTS

CLIENT

CCH LLC
838 BUSSE HIGHWAY
PARK RIDGE, IL 60068

PROJECT

ARLINGTON 425

ARLINGTON HEIGHTS, ILLINOIS
MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT

DRAWING TITLE

ARCHITECTURAL
SITE PLAN

FILE NAME 3883-28P Site Plan
DRAWN BY RDL DATE 11.13.18


NO.	REVISED PER	DATE	BY
1	TRUCK TURNING REQ.	11.21.18	RDL
2	DESIGN DEVELOPMENT	11.27.18	RDL
3	DESIGN DEVELOPMENT	11.30.18	RDL
4	PRELIM D.C. MEETING	12.17.18	RDL
5	DESIGN DEVELOPMENT	12.20.18	RDL
6	DC & PC SUBMITTALS	1.14.19	RDL
7	REVISED PC SUBMITTAL	2.18.19	RDL
8	REVISED DC SUBMITTAL	3.1.19	RDL
9	REVISED PC SUBMITTAL	3.15.19	RDL
10	REVISED PC SUBMITTAL	4.2.19	RDL

JOB NO. 388315

SHEET NO.
OF 13


CS

PROFESSIONAL DESIGN FIRM LICENSE #184-002934



CONTEXTUAL SITE PLAN

SCALE: 1" = 50'-0"



TINAGLIA ARCHITECTS+INC
814 W. NORTHWEST HIGHWAY
ARLINGTON HEIGHTS-IL 60004
VOICE • 847 253 0002
DATA • 847 253 3063
www.tinaglia.com

TINAGLIA
ARCHITECTS

CLIENT

CCH LLC
838 BUSSE HIGHWAY
PARK RIDGE, IL 60068

PROJECT

ARLINGTON 425
ARLINGTON HEIGHTS, ILLINOIS
MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT

DRAWING TITLE

CONTEXTUAL
SITE PLAN

FILE NAME 3883-27P Site Plan			
DRAWN BY RDL		DATE 11.13.18	
NO.	REVISED PER	DATE	BY
6	DC & PC SUBMITTALS	1.14.19	RDL
7	REVISED PC SUBMITTAL	2.18.19	RDL
8	REVISED DC SUBMITTAL	3.1.19	RDL
9	REVISED PC SUBMITTAL	3.15.19	RDL

JOB NO. 388315

SHEET NO.
OF 13 CP.1

TINAGLIA ARCHITECTS • INC
814 W. NORTHWEST HIGHWAY
ARLINGTON HEIGHTS • IL 60004
VOICE • 847 253 0002
DATA • 847 253 3063
www.tinaglia.com

TINAGLIA
ARCHITECTS

CLIENT

CCH LLC
838 BUSSE HIGHWAY
PARK RIDGE, IL 60068

PROJECT

ARLINGTON 425
ARLINGTON HEIGHTS, ILLINOIS
MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT

DRAWING TITLE

AERIAL FIRE
TRUCK DIAGRAM


FILE NAME 3883-27P Site Plan
DRAWN BY RDL DATE 3.15.19

NO.	REVISED PER	DATE	BY
9	REVISED PC SUBMITTAL	3.15.19	RDL


JOB NO. 388315

SHEET NO. OF AFD

PROFESSIONAL DESIGN FIRM LICENSE #184-002934




ARLINGTON 435: AERIAL FIRE TRUCK DIAGRAM
SCALE: 1" = 30'-0"



FOUNDATION PLAN

24,451 SQ. FT. FOOTPRINT



FIRST FLOOR PLAN

18,244 SQ. FT.

ARLINGTON 425 DEVELOPMENT: CAMPBELL BUILDING FLOOR PLANS

SCALE: 1" = 20'-0"

© COPYRIGHT 2019 TINAGLIA ARCHITECTS, INC.

TINAGLIA ARCHITECTS • INC
814 W. NORTHWEST HIGHWAY
ARLINGTON HEIGHTS • IL 60004
VOICE • 847 253 0002
DATA • 847 253 3063
www.tinaglia.com

TINAGLIA
ARCHITECTS

CLIENT

CCH LLC
838 BUSSE HIGHWAY
PARK RIDGE, IL 60068

PROJECT

ARLINGTON 425

ARLINGTON HEIGHTS, IL 60005
MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT

DRAWING TITLE

CAMPBELL BLDG.
FLOOR PLANS


FILE NAME 3883-27P
DRAWN BY RDL DATE 11.13.18

NO.	REVISED PER	DATE	BY
4	PRELIM D.C. MEETING	12.17.18	RDL
6	DC & PC SUBMITTALS	1.14.19	RDL
7	REVISED PC SUBMITTAL	2.18.19	RDL
8	REVISED DC SUBMITTAL	3.1.19	RDL
9	REVISED PC SUBMITTAL	3.15.19	RDL

JOB NO. 388315


SHEET NO. OF 13 CA.1

PROFESSIONAL DESIGN FIRM LICENSE #184-002934




SECOND FLOOR PLAN

19,201 SQ. FT.



TYPICAL RESIDENTIAL FLOOR PLAN (FLOORS 3-9)

24,423 SQ. FT.



ROOF TERRACE PLAN

7,382 SQ. FT.

ARLINGTON 425 DEVELOPMENT: CAMPBELL BUILDING FLOOR PLANS

SCALE: 1" = 20'-0"

TINAGLIA ARCHITECTS • INC
814 W. NORTHWEST HIGHWAY
ARLINGTON HEIGHTS • IL 60004
VOICE • 847 253 0002
DATA • 847 253 3063
www.tinaglia.com

TINAGLIA
ARCHITECTS

CLIENT

CCH LLC
838 BUSSE HIGHWAY
PARK RIDGE, IL 60068

PROJECT

ARLINGTON 425

ARLINGTON HEIGHTS, IL 60005
MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT

DRAWING TITLE

CAMPBELL BLDG.
FLOOR PLANS

FILE NAME 3883-2TP
DRAWN BY RDL DATE 11.13.18

NO.	REVISED PER	DATE	BY
4	PRELIM D.C. MEETING	12.17.18	RDL
5	ADD 26th UNIT PER FLOOR	1.8.19	RDL
6	DC & PC SUBMITTALS	1.14.19	RDL
7	REVISED PC SUBMITTAL	2.18.19	RDL
8	REVISED DC SUBMITTAL	3.1.19	RDL
9	REVISED PC SUBMITTAL	3.15.19	RDL


JOB NO. 388315

SHEET NO.
OF 13

CA.2


© COPYRIGHT 2019 TINAGLIA ARCHITECTS, INC.

PROFESSIONAL DESIGN FIRM LICENSE #184-002934



ARLINGTON 425: 225 W. CAMPBELL NORTH ELEVATION

SCALE: 1" = 15'-0"



ARLINGTON 425: 225 W. CAMPBELL EAST ELEVATION

SCALE: 1" = 15'-0"

ARLINGTON 425: 225 W. CAMPBELL WEST ELEVATION

SCALE: 1" = 15'-0"

TINAGLIA ARCHITECTS+INC
814 W. NORTHWEST HIGHWAY
ARLINGTON HEIGHTS-IL 60004
VOICE • 847 253 0002
DATA • 847 253 3063
www.tinaglia.com

TINAGLIA
ARCHITECTS+INC

CLIENT

CCH LLC
838 BUSSE HIGHWAY
PARK RIDGE, IL 60068

PROJECT

ARLINGTON 425

ARLINGTON HEIGHTS, IL 60005
MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT

DRAWING TITLE

CAMPBELL BLDG.
ELEVATIONS


FILE NAME	3883-27P	DATE	11.13.18
DRAWN BY	RDL		
NO.	REVISED PER	DATE	BY
4	PRELIM D.C. MEETING	12.17.18	RDL
6	DC & PC SUBMITTALS	1.14.19	RDL
7	REVISED PC SUBMITTAL	2.18.19	RDL
8	REVISED DC SUBMITTAL	3.1.19	RDL
9	REVISED PC SUBMITTAL	3.15.19	RDL

JOB NO. 388315

SHEET NO. **CA.3**
OF 13


PROFESSIONAL DESIGN FIRM LICENSE #184-002934

© COPYRIGHT 2019 TINAGLIA ARCHITECTS, INC.




ARLINGTON 425: 225 W. CAMPBELL SOUTH ELEVATION

SCALE: 1" = 15'-0"



ARLINGTON 425: 225 W. CAMPBELL DRIVE-THRU UNDERPASS LOOKING WEST SECTION ELEVATION

SCALE: 1" = 15'-0"



ARLINGTON 425: 225 W. DRIVE-THRU UNDERPASS LOOKING EAST SECTION ELEVATION

SCALE: 1" = 15'-0"

TINAGLIA ARCHITECTS • INC
814 W. NORTHWEST HIGHWAY
ARLINGTON HEIGHTS • IL 60004
VOICE • 847 253 0002
DATA • 847 253 3063
www.tinaglia.com

TINAGLIA
ARCHITECTS

CLIENT

CCH LLC
838 BUSSE HIGHWAY
PARK RIDGE, IL 60068

PROJECT

ARLINGTON 425
ARLINGTON HEIGHTS, IL 60005
MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT

DRAWING TITLE

CAMPBELL BLDG.
ELEVATIONS

FILE NAME 3883-27P			
DRAWN BY RDL		DATE 11.13.18	
NO.	REVISED PER	DATE	BY
4	PRELIM D.C. MEETING	12.17.18	RDL
5	ADD 26th UNIT PER FLOOR	1.8.19	RDL
6	DC & PC SUBMITTALS	1.14.18	RDL
7	REVISED PC SUBMITTAL	2.18.19	RDL
8	REVISED DC SUBMITTAL	3.1.19	RDL
9	REVISED PC SUBMITTAL	3.15.19	RDL

JOB NO. 388315

SHEET NO. OF 13 CA.4

PROFESSIONAL DESIGN FIRM LICENSE #184-002934

30,323 SQ. FT.

13,113 SQ. FT.

ARLINGTON 425: 44 S. HIGHLAND BUILDING FLOOR PLANS

SCALE: 1" = 20'-0"

30,323 SQ. FT.

30,323 SQ. FT.

OFFICE

RESTAURANT / RETAIL

RESIDENT GUEST / 2ND CAR

 RESTRICTED RESIDENTIAL

TINAGLIA ARCHITECTS • INC
814 W. NORTHWEST HIGHWAY
ARLINGTON HEIGHTS • IL 60004
VOICE • 847 253 0002
DATA • 847 253 3063
www.tinaglia.com

TINAGLIA ARCHITECTS

CLIENT

CCH LLC

838 BUSSE HIGHWAY
PARK RIDGE, IL 60068

PROJECT

ARLINGTON 425

ARLINGTON HEIGHTS, IL 60005
MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT

DRAWING TITLE

HIGHLAND BLDG. FLOOR PLANS

FILE NAME 3883-27P
DRAWN BY RDL DATE 11.13.18


NO.	REVISED PER	DATE	BY
2	DESIGN DEVELOPMENT	11.27.18	RDL
4	PRELIM D.C. MEETING	12.17.18	RDL
6	DC & PC SUBMITTALS	1.14.19	RDL
7	REVISED PC SUBMITTAL	2.18.19	RDL
8	REVISED DC SUBMITTAL	3.1.19	RDL
9	REVISED PC SUBMITTAL	3.15.19	RDL
10	REVISED PC SUBMITTAL	4.2.19	RDL

JOB NO. 388315

SHEET NO. **HL.1**
OF 13


PROFESSIONAL DESIGN FIRM LICENSE #184-002934

© COPYRIGHT 2019 TINAGLIA ARCHITECTS, INC.



TYPICAL 7th THROUGH 12th LEVEL RESIDENTIAL FLOOR PLAN

19,485 SQ. FT.



6th LEVEL PARKING GARAGE PLAN

30,323 SQ. FT.


ARLINGTON 425: 44 S. HIGHLAND BUILDING FLOOR PLANS

SCALE: 1" = 20'-0"


- OFFICE

RESTAURANT / RETAIL
- RESIDENT GUEST / 2ND CAR

RESTRICTED RESIDENTIAL



ROOF PLAN



AMENITY / ROOF TERRACE LEVEL FLOOR PLAN

12,844 SQ. FT.

TINAGLIA ARCHITECTS • INC
814 W. NORTHWEST HIGHWAY
ARLINGTON HEIGHTS • IL 60004
VOICE • 847 253 0002
DATA • 847 253 3063
www.tinaglia.com

TINAGLIA
ARCHITECTS

CLIENT

CCH LLC
838 BUSSE HIGHWAY
PARK RIDGE, IL 60068

PROJECT

ARLINGTON 425
ARLINGTON HEIGHTS, IL 60005
MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT

DRAWING TITLE

HIGHLAND BLDG.
FLOOR PLANS

FILE NAME	3883-27P	DATE	11.13.18
DRAWN BY	RDL	DATE	11.13.18
NO.	REVISED PER	DATE	BY
2	DESIGN DEVELOPMENT	11.27.18	RDL
4	PRELIM D.C. MEETING	12.17.18	RDL
6	DC & PC SUBMITTALS	1.14.19	RDL
7	REVISED PC SUBMITTAL	2.18.19	RDL
8	REVISED DC SUBMITTAL	3.1.19	RDL
9	REVISED PC SUBMITTAL	3.15.19	RDL
10	REVISED PC SUBMITTAL	4.2.19	RDL


JOB NO. 388315

SHEET NO.
OF 13

HL.2


© COPYRIGHT 2019 TINAGLIA ARCHITECTS, INC.

PROFESSIONAL DESIGN FIRM LICENSE #184-002934



ARLINGTON 425: 44 S. HIGHLAND WEST ELEVATION

SCALE: 1" = 15'-0"



ARLINGTON 425: 44 S. HIGHLAND NORTH ELEVATION

SCALE: 1" = 15'-0"

TINAGLIA ARCHITECTS • INC
814 W. NORTHWEST HIGHWAY
ARLINGTON HEIGHTS • IL 60004
VOICE • 847 253 0002
DATA • 847 253 3063
www.tinaglia.com

TINAGLIA
ARCHITECTS

CLIENT

CCH LLC

838 BUSSE HIGHWAY
PARK RIDGE, IL 60068

PROJECT

ARLINGTON 425

ARLINGTON HEIGHTS, IL 60005
MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT

DRAWING TITLE

HIGHLAND BLDG.
ELEVATIONS

FILE NAME 3883-27P

DRAWN BY RDL DATE 11.13.18


NO.	REVISED PER	DATE	BY
4	PRELIM D.C. MEETING	12.17.18	RDL
6	DC & PC SUBMITTALS	1.14.19	RDL
7	REVISED PC SUBMITTAL	2.18.19	RDL
8	REVISED DC SUBMITTAL	3.1.19	RDL
9	REVISED PC SUBMITTAL	3.15.19	RDL

JOB NO. 388315

SHEET NO. HL.3
OF 13


PROFESSIONAL DESIGN FIRM LICENSE #184-002934

© COPYRIGHT 2019 TINAGLIA ARCHITECTS, INC.



ARLINGTON 425: 44 S. HIGHLAND EAST ELEVATION

SCALE: 1" = 15'-0"



ARLINGTON 425: 44 S. HIGHLAND SOUTH ELEVATION

SCALE: 1" = 15'-0"

TINAGLIA ARCHITECTS, INC.
814 W. NORTHWEST HIGHWAY
ARLINGTON HEIGHTS, IL 60004
VOICE • 847 253 0002
DATA • 847 253 3063
www.tinaglia.com

TINAGLIA
ARCHITECTS

CLIENT

CCH LLC
838 BUSSE HIGHWAY
PARK RIDGE, IL 60068

PROJECT

ARLINGTON 425

ARLINGTON HEIGHTS, IL 60005
MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT

DRAWING TITLE

**HIGHLAND BLDG.
ELEVATIONS**

FILE NAME 3883-27P
DRAWN BY RDL DATE 11.13.18


NO.	REVISED PER	DATE	BY
4	PRELIM D.C. MEETING	12.17.18	RDL
6	DC & PC SUBMITTALS	1.14.19	RDL
7	REVISED PC SUBMITTAL	2.18.19	RDL
8	REVISED DC SUBMITTAL	3.1.19	RDL
9	REVISED PC SUBMITTAL	3.15.19	RDL

JOB NO. **388315**

SHEET NO. **HL.4**
OF 13


PROFESSIONAL DESIGN FIRM LICENSE #184-002934

© COPYRIGHT 2019 TINAGLIA ARCHITECTS, INC.




ROOF / ROOFTOP TERRACE PLAN

7,416 SQ. FT.




TYPICAL 2nd, 3rd & 4th RESIDENTIAL LEVEL FLOOR PLANS

17,148 SQ. FT.



FIRST FLOOR PLAN

17,112 SQ. FT.



UNDERGROUND PARKING GARAGE PLAN

21,032 SQ. FT. FOOTPRINT

ARLINGTON 425 DEVELOPMENT: CHESTNUT BUILDING FLOOR PLANS

SCALE: 1" = 20'-0"

© COPYRIGHT 2019 TINAGLIA ARCHITECTS, INC.

TINAGLIA ARCHITECTS • INC
814 W. NORTHWEST HIGHWAY
ARLINGTON HEIGHTS • IL 60004
VOICE • 847 253 0002
DATA • 847 253 3063
www.tinaglia.com

TINAGLIA
ARCHITECTS

CLIENT

CCH LLC

838 BUSSE HIGHWAY
PARK RIDGE, IL 60068

PROJECT

ARLINGTON 425

ARLINGTON HEIGHTS, IL 60005
MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT

DRAWING TITLE

CHESTNUT BLDG.
FLOOR PLANS

FILE NAME

3883-28P

DRAWN BY

RDL

DATE

11.13.18

NO.

REVISED PER

DATE

BY

4

PRELIM D.C. MEETING

12.17.18

KGB

5

ADD 14th UNIT PER FLOOR

1.8.19

RDL

6

DC & PC SUBMITTALS

1.14.19

RDL

7

REVISED PC SUBMITTAL

2.18.19

RDL

8

REVISED DC SUBMITTAL

3.1.19

RDL

9

REVISED PC SUBMITTAL

3.15.19

RDL

10

REVISED PC SUBMITTAL

4.2.19

RDL

JOB NO.


388315

SHEET NO.

OF 13


CH.1

PROFESSIONAL DESIGN FIRM LICENSE #184-002934




ARLINGTON 425: 33 S. CHESTNUT WEST ELEVATION

SCALE: 1" = 15'-0"




ARLINGTON 425: 33 S. CHESTNUT SOUTH ELEVATION

SCALE: 1" = 15'-0"



ARLINGTON 425: 33 S. CHESTNUT EAST ELEVATION

SCALE: 1" = 15'-0"



ARLINGTON 425: 33 S. CHESTNUT EAST-WEST SECTION ELEVATION

SCALE: 1" = 15'-0"



ARLINGTON 425: 33 S. CHESTNUT NORTH ELEVATION

SCALE: 1" = 15'-0"

TINAGLIA ARCHITECTS • INC
814 W. NORTHWEST HIGHWAY
ARLINGTON HEIGHTS • IL 60004
VOICE • 847 253 0002
DATA • 847 253 3063
www.tinaglia.com

TINAGLIA
ARCHITECTS

CLIENT

CCH LLC
838 BUSSE HIGHWAY
PARK RIDGE, IL 60068

PROJECT

ARLINGTON 425

ARLINGTON HEIGHTS, IL 60005
MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT

DRAWING TITLE

CHESTNUT BLDG.
ELEVATIONS

FILE NAME	3883-27P	DATE	11.13.18
DRAWN BY	RDL	DATE	11.13.18
NO.	REVISED PER	DATE	BY
4	PRELIM D.C. MEETING	12.17.18	KQB
5	ADD 14th UNIT PER FLOOR	1.8.19	RDL
6	DC & PC SUBMITTALS	1.14.18	RDL
7	REVISED PC SUBMITTAL	2.18.19	RDL
8	REVISED DC SUBMITTAL	3.1.19	RDL
9	REVISED PC SUBMITTAL	3.15.19	RDL
10	REVISED PC SUBMITTAL	4.2.19	RDL

JOB NO. 388315

SHEET NO. CH.2
OF 13

PROFESSIONAL DESIGN FIRM LICENSE #184-002934

© COPYRIGHT 2019 TINAGLIA ARCHITECTS, INC.















Traffic and Parking Impact Study **Proposed Arlington 425 Residential Development**

Arlington Heights, Illinois



Prepared For:

CCH LLC

KLOA
Kenig, Lindgren, O'Hara, Aboona, Inc.

March 15, 2019

1. Introduction

This report summarizes the methodologies, results and findings of a traffic and parking impact study conducted by Kenig, Lindgren, O'Hara, Aboona, Inc. (KLOA, Inc.) for the proposed Arlington 425 residential development to be located in Arlington Heights, Illinois. The site is located on the south side of Campbell Street and is bounded by Highland Avenue on the east and Chestnut Avenue on the west.

The concept plans call for three separate buildings to be developed as follows:

- 225 West Campbell Street. Located at the north end of the site, a nine-story building is proposed to include approximately 182 residential apartment units, and 31,072 square feet of retail, restaurant, and office space on the first and second floors.
- 44 South Highland Avenue. Located on the east side of the site, a 12-story building is proposed to include approximately 125 residential apartment units, 2,869 square feet of retail space, and possibly a 2,000 to 2,500 square-foot restaurant located on the amenity floor. An approximate 460-space parking garage will be located in the podium of the building. The parking will serve the residents of this building, residents of the 225 West Campbell Street building, and customers and employees of the retail space in 225 West Campbell Street. Access to the garage will be from two access drives off Highland Avenue, an access drive off Campbell Street, and an exit only access drive off Chestnut Avenue. A pedestrian tunnel will connect the two buildings.
- 33 South Chestnut Avenue. Located on the west side of the site, a four-story building is proposed to include approximately 54 residential apartment units and an approximate 84-space parking garage on two lower levels. Access to and from the garage will be from one access drive off Chestnut Avenue.

The purpose of this study was to examine background traffic conditions, assess the impact that the proposed development will have on traffic conditions in the area, and determine if any roadway or access improvements are necessary to accommodate traffic generated by the proposed development. Additionally, the adequacy of the proposed parking supply of the proposed development was also evaluated.

Figure 1 shows the location of the site in relation to the area roadway system. **Figure 2** shows an aerial view of the site area.

The sections of this report present the following.

- Existing roadway conditions
- A description of the proposed development
- Directional distribution of the development traffic
- Vehicle trip generation for the development
- Future traffic conditions including access to the development
- Traffic analyses for the weekday morning and evening peak hours
- Recommendations with respect to adequacy of the site access and adjacent roadway system
- Recommendations regarding the adequacy of the parking supply.


Traffic capacity analyses were conducted for the weekday morning and evening peak hours for the following conditions:

1. Existing (Year 2018/2019) Conditions - Analyzes the capacity of the existing roadway system using existing peak hour traffic volumes in the surrounding area.
2. Future (Year 2024) Conditions - The future projected traffic volumes include the existing traffic volumes, ambient area growth not attributable to any particular development, and the traffic estimated to be generated by the proposed subject development.



Site Location

Figure 1



Aerial View of Site Location

Figure 2

2. Existing Conditions

Existing transportation conditions in the vicinity of the site were documented based on field visits conducted by KLOA, Inc. in order to obtain a database for projecting future conditions. The following provides a description of the geographical location of the site, physical characteristics of the area roadway system including lane usage and traffic control devices and existing peak hour traffic volumes.

Site Location


The site is located to the west of downtown Arlington Heights and referred to in the Downtown Master Plan as a portion of “Block 425”. It is bounded by Campbell Street to the north, undeveloped land/Sigwalt Street to the south, Chestnut Avenue to the west, and Highland Avenue to the east. The site is currently undeveloped and is within walking distance to the Arlington Heights Metra Station for the Union Pacific – Northwest (UP-NW) Metra Rail Line. Land uses in the vicinity of the site are residential to the north, west, and south and include the Arlington Heights Vail Street public parking garage and the AT&T and Dunton Tower Luxury Apartments to the east.

Existing Roadway System Characteristics

The characteristics of the existing roadways near the development are described below. **Figure 3** illustrates the existing roadway characteristics. All roadways have a posted speed limit of 25 mph and are under the jurisdiction of the Village of Arlington Heights, unless otherwise noted.

Campbell Street is an east west local roadway that provides one lane in each direction and extends from Rohlwing Road to Evergreen Avenue. At its unsignalized intersection with Chestnut Avenue and Highland Avenue, Campbell Street provides a shared left/through/right-turn lane in both directions. High visibility crosswalks are provided on both legs at its intersection with Chestnut Avenue. Parking is generally provided on both sides of the roadway and is restricted to two-hours. Campbell Street is a designated bicycle route (signage only).

Chestnut Avenue is a north-south local roadway that provides one lane in each direction and extends from Wing Street south to South Street. At its intersection with Campbell Street both the northbound and southbound approaches provide a single lane allowing left-through-, and right-turning movements. At its unsignalized intersection with Sigwalt Street, Chestnut Avenue provides a shared left/through/right-turn lane under stop-sign control on both legs. North of Sigwalt Street, parking is prohibited on the west side of the roadway and is restricted to two-hours on the east side of the roadway. South of Sigwalt Street, parking is prohibited on the east side of the roadway and is restricted to two hours on the west side of the roadway. At its stop sign controlled intersection with Wing Street, a single lane approach is provided. A standard crosswalk is provided on the south leg at Wing Street, high visibility crosswalks are provided on both the north and south legs at Campbell Street, and no crosswalks are provided at its intersection with Sigwalt Street.



ARLINGTON 425 DEVELOPMENT
ARLINGTON HEIGHTS, ILLINOIS

EXISTING ROADWAY CHARACTERISTICS



Job No: 18-127

Figure: 3

Highland Avenue is a north-south local roadway that provides one lane in each direction and extends from Campbell Street south to Central Road. At its unsignalized intersection with Sigwalt Street, Highland Avenue provides a shared left/through/right-turn lane under stop-sign control and a high visibility crosswalk on both legs. At its unsignalized intersection with Campbell Street, Highland Avenue provides a shared left/through/right-turn lane under stop-sign control and a high visibility crosswalk on the south leg. It should be noted that between Campbell Street and Sigwalt Street, Highland Avenue traverses through the Arlington Heights Public Parking Garage, which provides parking on the west side of Highland Avenue and has two ramp access drives off Highland Avenue. Parking is prohibited on the east side of the roadway and is restricted to two-hours on the west side of the roadway.

Sigwalt Street is an east-west local roadway that in the vicinity of the site provides one lane in each direction. At its all-way stop-sign controlled intersection with Vail Avenue, Sigwalt Street provides a shared left/through/right-turn lane and high visibility crosswalks on both legs. At its unsignalized intersection with Highland Avenue, Sigwalt Street provides a shared left/through/right-turn lane and a high visibility crosswalk on both legs. At its unsignalized intersection with Chestnut Avenue, Sigwalt Street provides a shared left/through/right-turn lane on both legs. Parking is prohibited on both sides of the roadway except along the north side of Sigwalt Street between Highland Avenue and Vail Avenue which is restricted to two hours.

Vail Avenue is a north-south local roadway is that provides one lane in each direction and extends from Euclid Avenue south to Central Road. At its all-way stop sign-controlled intersection with Campbell Street, Vail Avenue provides a shared through/left-turn lane and a right-turn lane on the southbound approach, and a shared left/through/right turn lane on the northbound approach. Paver brick crosswalks are provided on all four legs of the intersection. On-street parking is restricted to two hours on both sides of the roadway. At its all-way stop sign-controlled intersection with Sigwalt Street, single lane approaches are provided on both the northbound and southbound approaches.

Dunton Avenue is a north-south local roadway that provides one lane in each direction. At its all-way stop sign controlled intersection with Campbell Street, a shared left/through/right-turn lane and a paver brick crosswalk is provided on all four approaches. On-street parking is restricted to two hours on both sides of the roadway.

Wing Street is an east-west local roadway that provides one lane in each direction. A standard crosswalk is provided on the east leg at its intersection with Chestnut Avenue. Parking is restricted to two hours on the south side of the roadway, west of Chestnut Avenue, and is restricted on both sides of the roadway east of Chestnut Avenue.

Mitchell Avenue is a north-south local roadway that provides one lane in each direction. At its stop sign controlled intersection with Campbell Street, a shared left/right-turn lane and a high-visibility crosswalk is provided on the northbound approach.

Ridge Avenue is a north-south local roadway that provides one lane in each direction. At its all-way stop sign controlled intersection with Campbell Street, a shared left/through/right-turn lane and a high-visibility crosswalk are provided on all four approaches. Ridge Avenue is designated as a bicycle route (signage only).

Existing Traffic Volumes

In order to determine current traffic conditions in the vicinity of the site, KLOA, Inc. conducted manual peak period vehicle, pedestrian, and bicycle traffic counts using Miovision Scout Collection Units during the weekday morning (7:00 A.M. to 9:00 A.M.) and weekday evening (4:00 P.M. to 6:00 P.M.) peak periods at the following twelve (12) intersections:



1. Highland Avenue and Campbell Street (AM – June 26, 2018; PM – February 7, 2019)
2. Chestnut Avenue and Campbell Street (AM – August 8, 2017; PM – February 7, 2019)
3. Highland Avenue and Sigwalt Street (AM – June 26, 2018; PM – February 7, 2019)
4. Chestnut Avenue and Sigwalt Street (June 26, 2018)
5. Vail Avenue and Campbell Street (AM – June 26, 2018; PM – February 7, 2019)
6. Vail Avenue and Sigwalt Street (May 18, 2017)
7. Dunton Avenue and Campbell Street (June 26, 2018)
8. Ridge Avenue and Campbell Street (June 26, 2018)
9. Mitchell Avenue and Campbell Street (June 26, 2018)
10. Chestnut Avenue and Wing Street (June 26, 2018)
11. Highland Avenue and North Garage Ramp (June 27, 2018)
12. Highland Avenue and South Garage Ramp (June 27, 2018)

The results of the traffic counts showed that the weekday morning peak hour of traffic generally occurs from 8:00 A.M. to 9:00 A.M. and the weekday evening peak hour of traffic generally occurs from 5:00 P.M. to 6:00 P.M. It is important to note that traffic counts were previously conducted at the intersections of Sigwalt Street at its intersections with Chestnut Avenue and Highland Avenue in May 2017 when school was in session. A comparison of these traffic counts to the current counts conducted for the weekday morning during the summer when school is not in session shows that the traffic along Sigwalt Street is comparable. Further, a comparison of the above-noted traffic counts for the intersection of Highland Avenue and Campbell Street conducted in February 2019 compared to former traffic counts conducted during the summer months in June 2018 shows that both the vehicle and pedestrian traffic at this intersection during the weekday evening peak hour is higher in the February counts than what was counted in the June counts. Lastly, the existing traffic volumes are increased by a regional growth factor for projected conditions (to be discussed later in this report), thereby providing for a conservative analysis for projected traffic conditions.

Traffic counts were also conducted for the four access driveways on the north side of Campbell Street between Chestnut Avenue and Highland Avenue that serve two residential developments. The access driveways to the far east are actually separate garage doors providing one inbound and one outbound access to the residential development. For the purposes of this study, these two separate garage doors are illustrated as one access drive.

Figure 4 illustrates the existing peak hour vehicle traffic volumes.

Figure 5 illustrates the existing peak hour pedestrian and bicycle traffic volumes.



ARLINGTON 425 DEVELOPMENT
ARLINGTON HEIGHTS, ILLINOIS

EXISTING PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE TRAFFIC VOLUMES

Weekday Evening and Saturday Evening Traffic Volumes

Traffic counts were also conducted at the intersections of Campbell with Chestnut, Highland, and Vail, and at the Highland and Sigwalt intersection on Thursday, February 7, Friday, February 8, and Saturday, February 9, 2019 from 4:00 P.M. to 10:00 P.M. each day. **Tables A through C** (located in the Appendix of this report) show the volume of traffic by hour traversing each intersection highlighting the peak hour of each intersection. As shown in the respective tables, the weekday evening peak hour analyzed in this study is higher than the nighttime hours. Further, the Saturday volumes are lower than the weekday volumes. As such, the weekday evening peak hour analyzed in this traffic study represents the peak traffic conditions in the area.

Accident Analysis

KLOA, Inc. obtained accident data from the Village of Arlington Heights and IDOT for the most recent available five years (2012 to 2016) for all of the studied intersections. **Table 1** summarizes the accident data for the intersections¹. A review of the data showed that the intersections are not high accident locations and that no fatalities were reported.

Table 1
ACCIDENT DATA SUMMARY

Intersection	Year				
	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Highland Avenue with Campbell Street	0	4	1	0	2
Chestnut Avenue with Campbell Street	1	0	1	0	2
Vail Avenue with Campbell Street	0	0	1	0	2
Highland Avenue with Sigwalt Street	1	1	1	0	1
Chestnut Avenue with Sigwalt Street	2	0	0	0	3
Ridge Avenue with Campbell Street	3	0	0	1	1
Mitchell Avenue with Campbell Street	0	0	0	0	0
Dunton Avenue with Campbell Street	1	0	0	0	3
Chestnut Avenue with Wing Street	0	0	0	0	0

¹ Disclaimer: The motor vehicle crash data referenced herein was partly provided by the Illinois Department of Transportation. The author is responsible for any data analyses and conclusions drawn.

Public Transportation

Sidewalks are provided on the surrounding roadway network and high-visibility or standard crosswalks are generally provided, as noted above. The intersection of Chestnut Avenue with Sigwalt Street does not provide crosswalks. Furthermore, the site is located approximately one-third of a mile walking distance from the Arlington Heights UP-NW Metra Station which offers daily service between Harvard/McHenry and Chicago.

The site is also within the vicinity of Pace Bus Route 696 (Randhurst/Woodfield/Harper College) which provides weekday service from Mt. Prospect to Palatine. Service operates from Randhurst Mall to Harper College. Rush hour service runs every 30 minutes and mid-day service runs every hour. This bus route serves the following major destinations: Randhurst Mall, Prospect H.S., Metra Union Pacific Northwest Line (Arlington Heights), Cook County Courthouse, Rolling Meadows Shopping Center, East Park, Mallard Cove, Woodfield Gardens, Motorola Headquarters, Schaumburg Convention Center, IKEA, Roosevelt University, Woodfield Mall, Pace Northwest Transportation Center, and Harper College.

3. Traffic Characteristics of the Proposed Development

To evaluate the impact of the subject development on the area roadway system, it was necessary to quantify the number of vehicle trips the overall development will generate during the weekday morning and the weekday evening peak hours and then determine the directions from which this traffic will approach and depart the individual sites.

Proposed Development Plan

The overall proposed development plan is included in the Appendix of this report and is detailed below.

- 225 West Campbell Street. Located at the north end of the site, a nine-story building is proposed to include approximately 182 residential apartment units, and 31,072 square feet of retail, restaurant, and office space on the first and second floors.
- 44 South Highland Avenue. Located on the east side of the site, a 12-story building is proposed to include approximately 125 residential apartment units, 2,869 square feet of retail space, and possibly a 2,000 to 2,500 square-foot restaurant located on the amenity floor. An approximate 460-space parking garage will be located in the podium of the building. The parking will serve the residents of this building, residents of the 225 West Campbell Street building, and customers and employees of the retail space in 225 West Campbell Street. Access to the garage will be from two access drives off Highland Avenue, an access drive off Campbell Street, and an exit only access drive off Chestnut Avenue. A pedestrian tunnel will connect the two buildings.
- 33 South Chestnut Avenue. Located on the west side of the site, a four-story building is proposed to include approximately 54 residential apartment units and an approximate 84-space parking garage on two lower levels. Access to and from the garage will be from one access drive off Chestnut Avenue.

Vehicle Access and Parking

Internal Circulation

An internal access drive is proposed to provide access to the 44 South Highland Avenue building garage, as well as to allow drop-off/pick-up of residents and guests. The access drive will have a traffic circle in the center providing drop-off/pick-up of pedestrians and providing vehicle circulation within the site and access to the parking garage in the 44 South Highland Avenue building, two loading docks, and short-term parking spaces. North of the traffic circle, the access provides two-way traffic flow and will T-intersect Campbell Street from the south providing one lane inbound and one lane outbound under stop sign control. West of the traffic circle, the access drive becomes one-way westbound (exit) only and will T-intersect Chestnut Avenue under stop sign control, restricted to right-out only turning movements. East of the traffic circle, the access drive will provide one lane inbound only from Highland Avenue.

Internal Access Drive Garage Access

Access to the 44 South Highland Avenue garage will be from both Highland Avenue as well as from the internal access drive at the north end of the building. Because of the one-way westbound orientation of the internal access drive between the garage access and Highland Avenue, turning movements to/from the garage access will be restricted to left-in/right-in/left-out only. Vehicles turning left into the garage from the east and turning right into the garage from the west will be under freeflow conditions. Vehicles exiting the garage will be under stop sign control and will be restricted to left-out only turning movements. Signage indicating the turning restriction and one-way travel will be provided.

Proposed Access and Campbell Street

Located approximately 130 feet east of Chestnut Avenue, this proposed access will provide one lane inbound and one lane outbound under stop sign control. The proposed access drive is located just to the west of the four access drives located on the north side of Campbell Street. Up to eight, on-street parking spaces could be provided on the south side of Campbell Street between Chestnut Avenue and Highland Avenue with the introduction of the new access drive. If permitted, these spaces should be striped so as to maintain existing sight lines at Highland Avenue and to provide adequate sight lines at the proposed access drive. A sight distance diagram is included in the Appendix, which indicates that if strictly adhered to, these eight on-street spaces will not be available.

44 South Highland Avenue and 225 West Campbell Street

As noted, an approximate 460-space parking garage will be located in the podium of the 44 South Highland Avenue building and will be accessible to the residents and commercial customers and employees of the 225 West Campbell Street building. Access to the garage will be from the proposed access drives off Campbell Street and Highland Avenue, as described above, in addition to a full access driveway off Highland Avenue, located in alignment with the southerly access ramp serving the public parking garage on the east side of the roadway. This access driveway will be restricted to residents only. Visual warning devices should be posted at this location to warn pedestrians of exiting traffic.

33 South Chestnut Avenue

Access to the approximate 84-space parking garage will be from a single driveway off Chestnut Avenue, approximately 220 feet north of Sigwalt Street. The access drive will provide one lane inbound and one lane outbound under stop sign control. Visual warning devices should be posted at this location to warn pedestrians of exiting traffic.

In conjunction with the proposed development, Chestnut Avenue will be widened approximately eight feet on the east side of the roadway along the site frontage to accommodate approximately ten on-street parking spaces.

Directional Distribution


The directions from which vehicles will approach and depart the overall site were estimated based on existing travel patterns, as determined from the traffic counts, as well as the type and location of the access drives proposed to serve the development. **Figure 6** illustrates the directional distribution of the development generated traffic. Figure 6 also shows the distance, in feet, between existing and proposed roadways.

Estimated Site Traffic Generation

The estimates of vehicle traffic to be generated by the development are based upon the proposed land use types and sizes. The volume of traffic generated was estimated using data published in the Institute of Transportation Engineers' (ITE) Trip Generation Manual, 10th Edition. However, the ITE trip rates are based on suburban rates where the primary mode of transportation is the automobile.

As previously indicated, the proposed development is located within one-third mile of the Arlington Heights Milwaukee District- Northwest Metra Station. A review of the census data indicates that approximately 15 percent of the residents located within one-quarter mile of the Metra station utilize alternative modes of transportation to get to work. As a result, the estimated number of generated trips was reduced by 15 percent to account for the residents that will use means of transportation other than the automobile to commute to work and or patron the proposed retail land uses. Further, the overall development is located in the heart of a major retail, entertainment, and commercial district that has pedestrian accessibility and provides nearby goods and services so that the residents need not drive.

Table 2 tabulates the total trips anticipated from this proposed development for the weekday morning and weekday evening peak hours, as well as the daily (two-way) traffic volumes.



ARLINGTON 425 DEVELOPMENT
 ARLINGTON HEIGHTS, ILLINOIS

ESTIMATED DIRECTIONAL DISTRIBUTION



Job No: 18-127 Figure: 6

Table 2

ESTIMATED VEHICLE TRIP GENERATION FOR THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

Development/Size	Weekday Morning Peak Hour		Weekday Evening Peak Hour		Weekday Daily Trips
	In	Out	In	Out	
<u>Residential</u>					
<u>44 South Highland Avenue</u>					
LUC 220 – 125 rental units	14	45	45	27	904
<u>225 West Campbell Street</u>					
LUC 220 – 182 rental units	19	65	63	37	1,335
<u>33 South Chestnut Avenue</u>					
LUC 220 – 54 rental units	<u>6</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>367</u>
Less 15% Reduction:	<u>-6</u>	<u>-20</u>	<u>-20</u>	<u>-11</u>	<u>-391</u>
Total Residential Vehicle Trips:	33	110	110	65	2,215
<u>Non-Residential Uses</u>					
<u>44 South Highland Avenue</u>					
LUC 820 – 2,869 s.f. Retail	2	0	3	5	76
LUC 931 – 2,500 s.f. Restaurant	2	0	13	7	210
<u>225 West Campbell Street</u>					
LUC 820 – 14,028 s.f. Retail	8	5	25	28	530
LUC 931 – 9,575 s.f. Restaurant	5	2	50	25	803
LUC 710 – 7,500 s.f. General Office	<u>7</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>73</u>
Less 15% Reduction:	<u>-4</u>	<u>-1</u>	<u>-13</u>	<u>-12</u>	<u>-254</u>
Total Non-Residential Vehicle Trips:	20	8	80	60	1,438
Total Development Traffic Volumes:	53	118	190	125	3,653

4. Projected Traffic Conditions

The total projected traffic volumes include the existing traffic volumes, increase in background traffic due to ambient growth, and the traffic estimated to be generated by the proposed subject development.

Development Traffic Assignment

The estimated weekday morning and evening peak hour traffic volumes that will be generated by the proposed development were assigned to the roadway system in accordance with the previously described directional distribution (Figure 6). The traffic assignment for the total development traffic is illustrated in **Figure 7**. Separate traffic assignments for the residential uses and the non-residential uses are shown in **Figure 7A** and **Figure 7B**, respectively, and are included in the Appendix of this report.

Background Traffic Conditions


The existing traffic volumes (Figure 4) were increased by a regional growth factor to account for the increase in existing traffic related to regional growth in the area (i.e., not attributable to any particular planned development). Based on the Village of Arlington Heights 2015 Comprehensive Plan, an increase of one-half percent per year over six years (three percent total) was applied to project Year 2024 conditions.

Figure 8 shows the Year 2024 Base (No-Build) traffic volumes.

Total Projected Traffic Volumes

Total projected traffic volumes include the Year 2024 Base traffic volumes (Figure 8) and the traffic estimated to be generated by the proposed overall development (Figure 7). It is important to note that the existing pedestrian and bicycle traffic volumes (Figure 5) were increased to account for projected pedestrian activity in this area.

Figure 9 shows the total projected vehicle traffic volumes.




ARLINGTON 425 DEVELOPMENT
 ARLINGTON HEIGHTS, ILLINOIS

YEAR 2024 BASE (NO BUILD) TRAFFIC VOLUMES



Job No: 18-127

Figure: 8



ARLINGTON 425 DEVELOPMENT
 ARLINGTON HEIGHTS, ILLINOIS

TOTAL PROJECTED TRAFFIC VOLUMES



Job No: 18-127

Figure: 9

5. Traffic Analysis and Recommendations

The following provides an evaluation conducted for the weekday morning and weekday evening peak hours. The analysis includes conducting capacity analyses to determine how well the roadway system and access drives are projected to operate and whether any roadway improvements or modifications are required.

Traffic Analyses

Roadway and adjacent or nearby intersection analyses were performed for the weekday morning and weekday evening peak hour periods for the existing (Year 2018/2019) and future projected (Year 2024) traffic volumes.

The traffic analyses were performed using the methodologies outlined in the Transportation Research Board's *Highway Capacity Manual (HCM)*, 2010 and analyzed using Synchro/SimTraffic computer software.

The analyses for the unsignalized intersections determine the average control delay to vehicles at an intersection. Control delay is the elapsed time from a vehicle joining the queue at a stop sign (includes the time required to decelerate to a stop) until its departure from the stop sign and resumption of free flow speed. The methodology analyzes each intersection approach controlled by a stop sign and considers traffic volumes on all approaches and lane characteristics.

The ability of an intersection to accommodate traffic flow is expressed in terms of level of service, which is assigned a letter from A to F based on the average control delay experienced by vehicles passing through the intersection. The *Highway Capacity Manual* definitions for levels of service and the corresponding control delay for signalized intersections and unsignalized intersections are included in the Appendix of this report.

Pedestrian and bicycle impacts are factored into the resulting levels of service and delay for each respective intersection. As noted, the existing pedestrian volumes were increased under projected traffic conditions to account for increased pedestrian activity in the area resulting from the proposed development.

Summaries of the traffic analysis results showing the level of service and overall intersection delay (measured in seconds) for the existing (Year 2018/2019) and Year 2024 total projected conditions are presented in **Tables 3 and 4**, respectively. **Table 5** shows the LOS and delay for the proposed access intersections for future conditions. A discussion of the intersections follows.

Table 3

CAPACITY ANALYSIS RESULTS – EXISTING TRAFFIC CONDITIONS

Intersection/Approach	Weekday Morning Peak Hour		Weekday Evening Peak Hour	
	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay
Highland Avenue and Campbell Street				
• Northbound Approach	B	10.1	B	12.3
Chestnut Avenue and Campbell Street				
• Northbound Approach	B	11.1	B	12.7
• Southbound Approach	B	10.5	B	12.3
Highland Avenue and Sigwalt Street				
• Northbound Approach	B	12.8	B	11.9
• Southbound Approach	B	14.3	B	14.1
Chestnut Avenue and Sigwalt Street				
• Overall	A	8.3	A	8.2
• Eastbound Approach	A	8.5	A	8.0
• Westbound Approach	A	8.1	A	8.3
• Northbound Approach	A	7.5	A	7.6
• Southbound Approach	A	7.9	A	7.9
Vail Avenue and Campbell Street				
• Overall	A	8.7	B	10.4
• Eastbound Approach	A	9.3	B	10.2
• Westbound Approach	A	8.3	B	10.0
• Northbound Approach	A	9.5	B	11.5
• Southbound Approach	A	8.8	B	10.2
Vail Avenue and Sigwalt Street				
• Overall	A	9.8	B	10.2
• Eastbound Approach	B	10.3	A	9.9
• Westbound Approach	A	9.6	B	10.7
• Northbound Approach	A	9.0	A	9.3
• Southbound Approach	A	9.5	B	10.1

Table 3
CAPACITY ANALYSIS RESULTS – EXISTING TRAFFIC CONDITIONS

Intersection/Approach	Weekday Morning Peak Hour		Weekday Evening Peak Hour	
	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay
Dunton Avenue and Campbell Street				
• Overall	A	8.3	B	10.1
• Eastbound Approach	A	8.5	A	9.8
• Westbound Approach	A	8.0	A	9.9
• Northbound Approach	A	8.2	B	10.4
• Southbound Approach	A	8.4	B	10.1
Ridge Avenue and Campbell Street				
• Overall	B	10.8	B	11.7
• Eastbound Approach	B	10.8	B	12.4
• Westbound Approach	B	9.5	B	10.7
• Northbound Approach	B	10.0	B	11.9
• Southbound Approach	B	11.0	B	11.2
Mitchell Avenue and Campbell Street				
• Northbound Approach	A	9.9	B	10.2
Chestnut Avenue and Wing Street				
• Northbound Approach	A	8.7	A	9.7
Highland Avenue and North Garage Ramp				
• Westbound Approach	A	9.0	A	9.3
Highland Avenue and South Garage Ramp				
• Westbound Approach	A	8.8	A	9.5
LOS = Level of Service Delay is measured in seconds.				

Table 4

CAPACITY ANALYSIS RESULTS – FUTURE TRAFFIC CONDITIONS

Intersection/Approach	Weekday Morning Peak Hour		Weekday Evening Peak Hour	
	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay
Highland Avenue and Campbell Street				
• Northbound Approach	B	12.2	C	15.6
<i>Highland and Campbell (All-Way Stop)</i>				
• Overall	A	8.4	A	9.6
• Eastbound Approach	A	8.6	A	9.5
• Westbound Approach	A	8.4	B	10.1
• Northbound Approach	A	7.8	A	8.9
Chestnut Avenue and Campbell Street				
• Northbound Approach	B	14.4	C	18.0
• Southbound Approach	B	13.0	C	15.4
Highland Avenue and Sigwalt Street				
• Northbound Approach	C	19.5	C	17.7
• Southbound Approach	E	36.1	D	34.2
<i>Highland Ave and Sigwalt St (All-Way Stop)</i>				
• Overall	B	11.1	B	10.8
• Eastbound Approach	B	12.1	B	10.1
• Westbound Approach	B	10.8	B	11.7
• Northbound Approach	A	9.4	A	9.2
• Southbound Approach	B	10.4	B	10.7
Chestnut Avenue and Sigwalt Street				
• Overall	A	8.5	A	8.5
• Eastbound Approach	A	8.8	A	8.4
• Westbound Approach	A	8.3	A	8.7
• Northbound Approach	A	7.6	A	7.8
• Southbound Approach	A	8.1	A	8.2

Table 4

CAPACITY ANALYSIS RESULTS – FUTURE TRAFFIC CONDITIONS

Intersection/Approach	Weekday Morning Peak Hour		Weekday Evening Peak Hour	
	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay
Vail Avenue and Campbell Street				
• Overall	A	9.2	B	11.7
• Eastbound Approach	A	9.7	B	11.5
• Westbound Approach	A	8.3	B	11.8
• Northbound Approach	A	9.7	B	12.7
• Southbound Approach	A	8.6	B	11.2
Vail Avenue and Sigwalt Street				
• Overall	B	10.9	B	12.8
• Eastbound Approach	B	11.9	B	12.2
• Westbound Approach	B	10.5	C	14.6
• Northbound Approach	A	9.4	B	10.3
• Southbound Approach	B	10.0	B	11.3
Duntun Avenue and Campbell Street				
• Overall	A	8.5	B	10.8
• Eastbound Approach	A	8.8	B	10.5
• Westbound Approach	A	8.2	B	10.7
• Northbound Approach	A	8.4	B	11.1
• Southbound Approach	A	8.6	B	10.7
Ridge Avenue and Campbell Street				
• Overall	B	10.9	B	12.5
• Eastbound Approach	B	11.2	B	13.4
• Westbound Approach	A	9.9	B	11.3
• Northbound Approach	B	10.4	B	12.6
• Southbound Approach	B	11.5	B	12.1

Table 4

CAPACITY ANALYSIS RESULTS – FUTURE TRAFFIC CONDITIONS

Intersection/Approach	Weekday Morning Peak Hour		Weekday Evening Peak Hour	
	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay
Mitchell Avenue and Campbell Street				
• Northbound Approach	B	11.7	B	11.5
Chestnut Avenue and Wing Street				
• Northbound Approach	A	9.9	B	10.9
Highland Avenue and North Garage Ramp				
• Westbound Approach	B	10.6	B	11.9
LOS = Level of Service Delay is measured in seconds.				

Table 5

CAPACITY ANALYSIS RESULTS FOR PROPOSED INTERSECTIONS
FUTURE (YEAR 2024) CONDITIONS

Intersection/Approach	Weekday Morning Peak Hour		Weekday Evening Peak Hour	
	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay
Campbell Street and Proposed Access				
• Northbound Approach	B	12.1	B	12.6
Chestnut Avenue and Exit Access				
• Westbound Approach	A	9.5	A	9.7
Chestnut Avenue and 33 West Chestnut Access				
• Westbound Approach	A	9.9	B	10.3
Highland Avenue and South Garage Ramp/Access				
• Eastbound Approach	B	10.9	B	11.8
• Westbound Approach	B	11.3	C	15.4
LOS = Level of Service Delay is measured in seconds.				

Discussion and Recommendations

The following summarizes how the intersections are projected to operate and identify any roadway and traffic control improvements to accommodate the development traffic.

Highland Avenue and Campbell Street

The northbound approach currently operates at a LOS B or better during the peak hours. Under future conditions, the northbound approach will continue to operate at acceptable levels of service during the peak hours with minimal increases in overall delay. The queue analysis shows that the northbound queue on Highland Avenue will not exceed one to two vehicles during peak hours. Furthermore, westbound left-turn movements from Campbell Street onto Highland Avenue are projected to continue operating at LOS A during the peak hours with increases in delay of less than one second and 95th percentile queues of one to two vehicles. Although a review of peak hour traffic volumes shows that an all-way stop sign-controlled intersection is not warranted, consideration should be given for this intersection to be under all-way stop sign control. The analyses show that this intersection will continue to operate at good levels of service as an all-way stop sign controlled intersection. Regardless of the traffic control at this intersection, the proposed development traffic will have a limited impact on the operations of this intersection. High-visibility crosswalks should be provided on the west and south legs of the intersection.

Chestnut Avenue and Campbell Street

The results of the capacity analyses indicate that the northbound and southbound approaches currently operate at LOS B or better during the peak hours. Under future conditions, the northbound and southbound approaches are projected to continue to operate at LOS B or better during the peak hours with minimal increases in delay. Further, a review of peak hour traffic volumes shows that an all-way stop sign controlled intersection is not warranted. As such, the proposed development traffic will have a limited impact on the operations of this intersection and no roadway or traffic control improvements will be required. The existing high-visibility crosswalks on all four legs should be restriped due to weathering/fading.

Highland Avenue and Sigwalt Street

The results of the capacity analyses indicate that the southbound approach will operate at a less than desirable LOS under the projected peak hour conditions as a two-way stop sign controlled intersection. However, the queue analysis shows that the southbound traffic on Highland Avenue will not exceed two to three vehicles. Although a review of peak hour traffic volumes shows that an all-way stop sign-controlled intersection is not warranted, this intersection was also analyzed assuming all-way stop sign control. The analyses show that the overall intersection, as well as the individual approaches, will operate at an LOS B or better for both peak hours under projected conditions. The existing high-visibility crosswalks on all four legs should be restriped due to weathering/fading.

Chestnut Avenue and Sigwalt Street

The results of the capacity analyses indicate that the northbound and southbound approaches currently operate at LOS B during the weekday morning and weekday evening peak hours. Under future conditions, the northbound and southbound approaches are projected to continue operating at LOS B during the peak hours with minimal increases in delay. Further, a review of peak hour traffic volumes shows that an all-way stop sign controlled intersection is not warranted. As such, the proposed development traffic will have a limited impact on the operations of this intersection and no roadway or traffic control improvements will be required. High-visibility crosswalks are recommended on all four legs of the intersection. No crosswalks currently exist on any leg.

Vail Avenue and Campbell Street

The intersection will continue operating at a LOS B or better during both peak hours under projected conditions. As such, the proposed development traffic will have a limited impact on the operations of this intersection and no roadway or traffic control improvements will be required.

Vail Avenue and Sigwalt Street

The intersection will continue operating at a LOS B or better during both peak hours under projected conditions. As such, the proposed development traffic will have a limited impact on the operations of this intersection and no roadway or traffic control improvements will be required.

Dunton Avenue and Campbell Street

The intersection will continue operating at a LOS B or better during both peak hours under projected conditions. As such, the proposed development traffic will have a limited impact on the operations of this intersection and no roadway or traffic control improvements will be required.

Ridge Avenue and Campbell Street

The intersection will continue operating at a LOS B or better during both peak hours under projected conditions. As such, the proposed development traffic will have a limited impact on the operations of this intersection and no roadway or traffic control improvements will be required.

Mitchell Avenue and Campbell Street

The intersection will continue operating at a LOS B or better during both peak hours under projected conditions. As such, the proposed development traffic will have a limited impact on the operations of this intersection and no roadway or traffic control improvements will be required.

Chestnut Avenue and Wing Street

The intersection will continue operating at a LOS A during both peak hours under projected conditions. As such, the proposed development traffic will have a limited impact on the operations of this intersection and no roadway or traffic control improvements will be required.

Highland Avenue with North Garage Ramp

As noted, the Arlington Heights Public Parking Garage is located on the east side of Highland Avenue, between Campbell Street and Sigwalt Street. The garage extends to the west side of Highland Avenue providing parking on the west side of the roadway and two access drives on the east side of the roadway that provide access to the garage ramps. The analyses show that the northerly garage ramp will continue operating at good levels of service under projected conditions, which includes the introduction of two new access drives on the west side of Highland Avenue serving the proposed development. No roadway or traffic control improvements are recommended on Highland Avenue in conjunction with the proposed development.

Proposed Access and Campbell Street

As noted, the development proposes an internal access drive system that will bifurcate the site, separating the Campbell Street building from the Chestnut and Highland Avenue buildings to the south. A traffic circle will be provided at the front of the Campbell Street building to allow access to Highland Avenue, Campbell Street, and Chestnut Avenue, in addition to providing internal circulation and access to drop-off/pick-up loading areas, short-term parking, and access to the parking garage. North of the traffic circle will be a two-lane access drive that will T-intersect Campbell Street from the south, approximately 130 feet east of Chestnut Avenue. Drop off areas will be located off to the side of the drive aisle, similar to on-street parking. There is adequate room for vehicles to pass by vehicles that are stopped to allow for the boarding and alighting of passengers, which will occur on the curb side. Further, pedestrian movements across the lanes will be minimal since each building will have its own designated drop-off lane. “No parking or standing” signage will be posted.

At its intersection with Campbell Street, this proposed access will provide one lane inbound and one lane outbound under stop sign control. The proposed access drive is located just to the west of the four access drives located on the north side of Campbell Street. Both the capacity analysis and the traffic simulation along the Campbell Street corridor between Chestnut Avenue and Highland Avenue show that through traffic will not be impeded along this corridor with the introduction of this proposed access drive. Further, the access drives on the north side of Campbell Street have very low volumes of traffic during the peak hour periods. As such, turning movement conflicts between these access driveways and the proposed access driveway to the south will be low. Therefore, no roadway improvements are needed with respect to providing a westbound left-turn lane or an eastbound right-turn lane. A sight distance diagram included in the Appendix indicates that if strictly adhered to, the on-street parking spaces on the south side of Campbell Street should be removed. Field observations during peak periods show that the existing parking spaces on the south side of Campbell Street are not used during the weekday morning peak hour but are occupied during the weekday evening peak hour.

Providing access on Campbell Street with an entrance access only on Highland Avenue and a right-out only on Chestnut Avenue will ensure that an adequate and flexible access system is provided. It will reduce the traffic movements on Highland Avenue, particularly at its intersection with Campbell Street, thereby ensuring that efficient traffic operations are maintained at the access drives and adjacent intersections.

Highland Avenue with Proposed (Inbound) Access Drive

East of the traffic circle, the access drive will have a one-way westbound/inbound orientation only from Highland Avenue providing one lane of traffic. The results of the capacity analyses show that introducing an inbound only access drive off Highland Avenue at this location will not impede through traffic operations along Highland Avenue or turning movements to/from the two garage ramps serving the parking garage located on the east side of Highland Avenue. Further, the analyses show that there is reserved capacity along Highland Avenue to accommodate additional traffic under projected conditions. As such, the proposed access drive will be adequate in accommodating the traffic projected to be generated by the proposed development and will have a limited impact on the operations of Highland Avenue. A high-visibility crosswalk should be provided across the driveway.

Chestnut Avenue and Exit Access

West of the proposed traffic circle, the proposed east-west roadway will be narrowed to one-way westbound only and will serve as an exit only from the development at its T-intersection with Chestnut Avenue. The exit will be designed to physically restrict exiting turning movements to right-turns only and will be under stop sign control. As such, any vehicle desiring to exit the development from this access drive must travel northbound to Campbell Street, thereby minimizing its impact on Chestnut Avenue between Campbell Street and Sigwalt Street. As shown in Figure 8, the outbound turning movements projected to exit during peak hours are less than 12 vehicles. Therefore, this proposed access will have a low impact on the existing operations along Chestnut Avenue. A high visibility crosswalk should be provided across the driveway. Do Not Enter signage should be posted at the exit to deter opposing vehicles from entering the one-way westbound/exit orientation.

Highland Avenue with Proposed Access/South Garage Ramp

An access drive is proposed on the west side of Highland Avenue in alignment with the southerly garage ramp on the east side of Highland Avenue. The access will provide direct access to the parking garage proposed as part of the 44 South Highland Avenue residential building. The access drive will be restricted to resident traffic only and will provide one lane inbound and one lane outbound under stop sign control. Further, the traffic estimated to access this drive during peak hours is low and will have a very low impact on the traffic and parking operations along Highland Avenue.

Visual warning devices should be posted at the access drive to alert both pedestrians and approaching vehicles of exiting traffic. Further, additional lighting should be considered within the public garage, including during the daytime, to improve visibility of both the proposed access drive as well as the two existing ramp driveways serving the public parking garage. A sight distance diagram is included in the Appendix.

Chestnut Avenue and 33 South Chestnut Access

An access driveway is proposed off Chestnut Avenue to provide access to the parking garage for the proposed 33 South Chestnut residential building. The access driveway will be located approximately 220 feet north of Sigwalt Street and will provide one lane inbound and one lane outbound under stop sign control. A high visibility crosswalk should be provided across the driveway. Further, visual warning devices should be considered to warn passing pedestrians of exiting vehicles.

As noted, on-street parking is prohibited on the west side of the roadway and is restricted to two hours on the east side of the roadway. Given the limited width of the roadway and with a car parked on the east side of the roadway, when two opposing vehicles approach, the northbound vehicle must yield to southbound traffic before bypassing the parked vehicle. In addition, given the low volumes of vehicles estimated to utilize the proposed access drive on Chestnut Avenue, it will have a low impact on the traffic and parking operations on Chestnut Avenue between Campbell Street and Sigwalt Street.

It is important to note that approximately six access driveways serving single-family homes were previously located on the east side of Chestnut Avenue, in addition to a surface parking lot that had two full access drives off Chestnut Avenue, near Campbell Street. The subject development is proposing two access drives off Chestnut Avenue, of which the northerly access drive will be restricted to exiting right-turns only and the southerly access drive will be a full access drive that will only serve the residents of 33 South Chestnut Avenue, which is shown to have low traffic volumes during peak hours.

Chestnut Avenue Widening

In conjunction with the proposed development, Chestnut Avenue will be widened approximately eight feet on the east side of the roadway along the site frontage to accommodate approximately 10 on-street parking spaces. The proposed widening will improve through traffic flow for both

directions of travel on Chestnut Avenue since currently northbound vehicles must yield to opposing southbound vehicles when there is a parked vehicle on the east side of the roadway.

Fire/Emergency and Truck Circulation

Fire/Emergency vehicles will access the development via the Highland Avenue access drive and proceed west and then south down the courtyard. To exit, the emergency vehicles will reverse from the courtyard and exit via the proposed access drives off Campbell Street or Chestnut Street.

Single-unit trucks and garbage trucks will utilize the internal access driveway to access the three proposed buildings included in the overall development.

Autoturns were conducted for passenger vehicles, trucks and emergency vehicles navigating the site and are included in the Appendix of this report (**Figures A through E**).

Internal Circulation

- As noted, the development proposes an internal access drive system that will connect to Highland Avenue, Chestnut Avenue, and Campbell Street. This proposed access driveway has been designed to maximize traffic functions to occur on-site rather than requiring redundant circulation on the surrounding roadway system.
- Residents and guests can access the 44 South Highland Avenue parking garage from the proposed northerly access drive off Highland Avenue or the proposed access off Campbell Street. Vehicles exiting the garage can either turn left and head west to exit via Chestnut Avenue or Campbell Street.
- Loading areas will be provided on-site to allow for small unit truck deliveries, as well as the pick-up/drop-off of pedestrians. A two-bay loading area will also be provided off Highland Avenue between the two proposed access drives.
- Short-term parking spaces will be provided off the access driveway that are conveniently located for easy access to any of the three buildings.
- As noted, small delivery trucks and trash trucks will utilize the access driveway, thereby removing these standing/loading functions from the surrounding roadways.

Internal Access Drive Garage Access

Access to the 44 South Highland Avenue garage will be from both Highland Avenue as well as from the internal access drive at the north end of the building. Because of the one-way westbound orientation of the internal access drive between the garage access and Highland Avenue, turning movements to/from the garage access will be restricted to left-in/right-in/left-out only. Vehicles turning left into the garage from the east and turning right into the garage from the west will be under freeflow conditions. Vehicles exiting the garage will be under stop sign control and will be restricted to left-out only turning movements. Signage indicating the turning restriction and one-way travel will be provided.

Pedestrian Mobility

The development proposes a pedestrian network system both within the development, as well as along the site frontage of the surrounding roadways (Chestnut Avenue, Campbell Street, and Highland Avenue). Further, it is our understanding that a pedestrian crossing study conducted by others for the Village of Arlington Heights to determine where mid-block pedestrian crossings are desired. The study recommended a mid-block pedestrian crossing on Campbell Street on the west leg of its intersection with the Public Alley that T-intersects Campbell Street from the north, just east of Highland Avenue. Further, high-visibility crosswalks should be provided on surrounding intersections, as identified earlier in this study.

Sight Distance Evaluation

A sight distance evaluation was conducted at Campbell Street with Chestnut Avenue, Highland Avenue, and the proposed full access drive, as well as the proposed garage access drive off Highland Avenue using Village standards. Sight distance diagrams (**Figure F** and **Figure G**, respectively) are included in the Appendix of this report. As shown in Figure F, to comply with sight distance standards as outlined in Village Code, and as noted earlier, all on-street parking on the south side of Campbell Street from west of Chestnut Avenue to east of Highland Avenue will need to be removed, resulting in a loss of eight to ten on-street parking spaces.

6. Parking Evaluation

The overall development proposes a total of 543 parking spaces, resulting in a 1.50 parking spaces per residential unit parking ratio. Further, the overall development proposes a total of 460 bedrooms, resulting in a 1.18 parking spaces per bedroom parking ratio. As such, the proposed parking supply is adequate to accommodate peak parking demands based on industry standards, as noted below.

Parking Based on ITE Data

In reviewing the survey data published in the 4th Edition of the *ITE Parking Generation Manual* for Land Use Code 221 (Low/Mid-Rise Apartments), the following was determined:

- The average peak parking demand ratio based on the number of bedrooms ranged between 0.9 and 1.0 spaces per bedroom. The development proposes 543 parking spaces for a total of approximately 460 bedrooms (1.18 spaces per bedroom ratio).
- The rate shows a direct correlation between the number of bedrooms and the peak parking demand. Developments with less than 1.5 bedrooms per unit had a peak parking demand of 92 percent of the average peak parking demand. This will apply to the proposed development since the development proposes an average of 1.3 bedrooms per unit.

Parking Based on Transit-Oriented Development Data

The proposed development is considered a Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) due to its close proximity to the Metra station, other nearby modes of travel, and the availability of goods and services within a walkable distance.

Parking studies conducted of similar TOD developments in the area show that car ownership is approximately 15 percent less for residents in a TOD development. Further, studies have also found that the peak parking demand ranged from 0.9 vehicles per unit to 1.05 vehicles per unit. Also, the close proximity of commuter parking that can be used in the evening will also benefit the development with respect to visitors for the residential development.

Lastly, the proposed parking ratio of 1.50 spaces per unit is similar to other apartment developments (built or planned) in the Chicago area that are located within proximity to train stations. A review of the parking supply at similar developments indicates that they provide an average ratio of 1.26 spaces per unit. Approximately 60 percent of the apartment developments provide less than 1.25 spaces per unit. A summary table of the location, number of units, and parking spaces provided for these developments is shown in **Table 6**.

Table 6
PARKING RATIOS OF APARTMENT DEVELOPMENTS (NEAR PUBLIC TRANSIT)

Development	Location	Units	Parking	Parking Ratio
River 595	Des Plaines	60	104	1.73
Kingston Pointe	Des Plaines	144	228	1.58
Walker & Parker	Clarendon Hills	42	42	1.00
Forest & Gilbert	Downers Grove	89	102	1.15
Adriatic Grove	Downers Grove	48	64	1.33
Residences at the Grove	Downers Grove	294	345	1.17
100 North Addison	Elmhurst	165	199	1.21
1717 Ridge	Evanston	175	205	1.17
AMLI Evanston	Evanston	214	312	1.46
Central Station	Evanston	80	80	1.00
E2	Evanston	356	371	1.04
The Reserve at Evanston	Evanston	195	219	1.12
Midtown Square	Glenview	138	160	1.16
The Reserve at Glenview	Glenview	239	333	1.39
Uptown La Grange	La Grange	254	336	1.32
Ninety7Fifty on the Park	Orland Park	295	300	1.02
Wheaton 121	Wheaton	306	400	1.31
The Residences of Wilmette	Wilmette	75	117	1.56
Average		185	224	1.26

Shared Parking

The development is proposing a total of 543 parking spaces, of which 460 parking spaces will be provided within the 44 South Highland building garage that will be shared between residents/guests, as well as for the use of the proposed restaurant, retail, and office uses. As noted above, the proposed parking supply exceeds the parking required by established Code.

At the direction of the Village, a shared parking analysis was conducted assuming a parking requirement of 1.5 parking spaces per residential unit, regardless of the number of bedrooms proposed within the unit.

Using ITE parking rates and ULI hourly distributions, a shared parking analysis was conducted under the following scenarios for both weekday and weekend conditions.

Table 7 shows a shared parking analysis for a weekday condition based on the modified Village Code of 1.5 parking spaces per residential unit. As shown in Table 7, the modified Code would require the development to provide a total of 528 parking spaces. However, the shared parking analysis for the 460 parking spaces show that the peak parking demand will be approximately 441 parking spaces, thereby providing a parking surplus of 19 parking spaces during peak parking demand.

Table 8 shows a shared parking analysis for a weekday condition using peak parking demand rates as identified in ITE parking standards. Using ITE data, a total of 512 parking spaces are needed considering the individual land uses proposed. However, under the shared parking analysis, the peak parking demand would be 389 parking spaces. Therefore, the proposed 460 parking spaces that would be shared among the two buildings and land uses are adequate to accommodate peak parking demands based on industry standards and will result in a parking surplus of approximately 71 vehicles during the peak parking demand.

Table 9 shows a shared parking analysis for a weekday condition that was conducted at the request of the Village of Arlington Heights, which includes using the Village Code parking requirement of 1.5 parking spaces per residential unit and ITE/ULI parking standards for all non-residential uses. Under this scenario, the shared parking analysis shows a peak parking demand deficit of five parking spaces.

Table 10 shows a shared parking analysis for a weekend condition using peak parking demand rates as identified in ITE/ULI parking standards. Using ITE/ULI data, a total of 477 parking spaces are needed considering the individual land uses proposed. However, under the shared parking analysis, the peak parking demand would be 406 parking spaces. Therefore, the proposed 460 parking spaces that would be shared among the two buildings and land uses are adequate to accommodate peak parking demands based on industry standards and will result in a parking surplus of approximately 54 vehicles during the peak parking demand.

Table 11 shows a shared parking analysis for a weekend condition that was conducted at the request of the Village of Arlington Heights, which includes using the Village Code parking requirement of 1.5 parking spaces per residential unit and ITE parking standards for all non-residential uses. Under this scenario, the shared parking analysis shows a peak parking demand deficit of 86 parking spaces. It is important to note that the parking analysis assumes all “new” vehicles arriving for the non-residential uses, rather than deducting for patrons of these uses that may live in the development itself or nearby that may arrive by walking or another form of transportation that does not require a parking space, thereby providing for a conservative analysis.

Table 7
Shared Parking Analysis - Arlington 425
Weekday - Arlington Heights Zoning Code

<u>Land Use/Density</u>	<u>Parking Spaces Required</u>
<u>Retail</u>	
16,028 s.f.	24
<u>Restaurants</u>	
12,075 s.f.	35
<u>Office</u>	
7,500 s.f.	8
<u>44 South Highland Residential</u>	
125 Units	188
<u>225 Campbell Residential</u>	
182 Units	273

Total Peak Parking Demand based on Individual Land Use: 528
Total Peak Parking Space Demand based on Shared Parking: 441
Parking Spaces Proposed: 460
Parking Surplus/(Deficit): 19

Time	Retail	Restaurant	Office	Residential	Total
6:00 AM	0	9	0	424	433
7:00 AM	1	15	5	341	362
8:00 AM	4	20	6	295	325
9:00 AM	9	27	8	295	339
10:00 AM	16	30	8	295	349
11:00 AM	22	32	8	295	357
12:00 PM	24	35	7	295	361
1:00 PM	23	32	6	295	356
2:00 PM	23	19	7	295	344
3:00 PM	21	15	6	295	337
4:00 PM	19	15	6	203	243
5:00 PM	15	27	4	272	318
6:00 PM	15	29	2	318	364
7:00 PM	18	22	0	304	344
8:00 PM	17	23	0	346	386
9:00 PM	0	22	0	355	377
10:00 PM	0	17	0	424	441

Table 8
Shared Parking Analysis - Arlington 425
Weekday - ITE Parking Generation Manual, 4th Edition

<u>Land Use/Density</u>	<u>Average Peak Parking Demand</u>
<u>Retail</u>	
16,028 s.f.	33
<u>Restaurants</u>	
12,075 s.f.	85
<u>Office</u>	
7,500 s.f.	16
<u>44 South Highland Residential</u>	
125 Units	154
<u>225 Campbell Residential</u>	
182 Units	224

Total Peak Parking Demand based on Individual Land Use: 512
Total Peak Parking Space Demand based on Shared Parking: 389
Parking Spaces Proposed: 460
Parking Surplus/(Deficit): 71

Time	Retail	Restaurant	Office	Residential	Total
6:00 AM	0	22	0	348	370
7:00 AM	2	37	9	280	328
8:00 AM	6	48	13	242	309
9:00 AM	13	65	15	242	335
10:00 AM	22	72	16	242	352
11:00 AM	30	78	16	242	366
12:00 PM	33	85	14	242	374
1:00 PM	32	77	12	242	363
2:00 PM	31	45	13	242	331
3:00 PM	29	36	13	242	320
4:00 PM	26	36	12	166	240
5:00 PM	20	65	7	223	315
6:00 PM	21	71	4	261	357
7:00 PM	25	54	0	249	328
8:00 PM	23	56	0	284	363
9:00 PM	0	54	0	291	345
10:00 PM	0	41	0	348	389

Table 9
Shared Parking Analysis - Arlington 425
Weekday - Village Code (Residential) and ITE (All Other Uses)

<u>Land Use/Density</u>	<u>Average Peak Parking Demand</u>
<u>Retail</u>	
16,028 s.f.	33
<u>Restaurants</u>	
12,075 s.f.	85
<u>Office</u>	
7,500 s.f.	16
<u>44 South Highland Residential</u>	
125 Units	188
<u>225 Campbell Residential</u>	
182 Units	273

Total Peak Parking Demand based on Individual Land Use: 595
Total Peak Parking Space Demand based on Shared Parking: 465
Parking Spaces Proposed: 460
Parking Surplus/(Deficit): (5)

Time	Retail	Restaurant	Office	Residential	Total
6:00 AM	0	22	0	424	446
7:00 AM	2	37	9	341	389
8:00 AM	6	48	13	295	362
9:00 AM	13	65	15	295	388
10:00 AM	22	72	16	295	405
11:00 AM	30	78	16	295	419
12:00 PM	33	85	14	295	427
1:00 PM	32	77	12	295	416
2:00 PM	31	45	13	295	384
3:00 PM	29	36	13	295	373
4:00 PM	26	36	12	203	277
5:00 PM	20	65	7	272	364
6:00 PM	21	71	4	318	414
7:00 PM	25	54	0	304	383
8:00 PM	23	56	0	346	425
9:00 PM	0	54	0	355	409
10:00 PM	0	41	0	424	465

Table 10
Shared Parking Analysis - Arlington 425
Weekend - ITE Parking Generation Manual, 4th Edition

<u>Land Use/Density</u>	<u>Average Peak Parking Demand</u>
<u>Retail</u>	
16,028 s.f.	37
<u>Restaurants</u>	
12,075 s.f.	108
<u>Office</u>	
7,500 s.f.	16
<u>44 South Highland Residential</u>	
125 Units	129
<u>225 Campbell Residential</u>	
182 Units	187

Total Peak Parking Demand based on Individual Land Use: 477
Total Peak Parking Space Demand based on Shared Parking: 406
Parking Spaces Proposed: 460
Parking Surplus/(Deficit): 54

Time	Retail	Restaurant	Office	Residential	Total
6:00 AM	0	22	0	316	338
7:00 AM	5	32	3	284	324
8:00 AM	10	55	10	269	344
9:00 AM	22	79	13	253	367
10:00 AM	28	102	14	237	381
11:00 AM	33	108	16	221	378
12:00 PM	37	100	14	205	356
1:00 PM	37	91	13	221	362
2:00 PM	36	68	10	221	335
3:00 PM	34	42	6	221	303
4:00 PM	28	52	3	237	320
5:00 PM	25	59	2	269	355
6:00 PM	27	68	1	284	380
7:00 PM	19	80	0	307	406
8:00 PM	19	59	0	310	388
9:00 PM	0	42	0	313	355
10:00 PM	0	43	0	316	359

Table 11
Shared Parking Analysis - Arlington 425
Weekend - Village Code (Residential) and ITE/ULI (All Other Uses)

<u>Land Use/Density</u>	<u>Average Peak Parking Demand</u>
<u>Retail</u>	
16,028 s.f.	37
<u>Restaurants</u>	
12,075 s.f.	108
<u>Office</u>	
7,500 s.f.	16
<u>44 South Highland Residential</u>	
125 Units	188
<u>225 Campbell Residential</u>	
182 Units	273

Total Peak Parking Demand based on Individual Land Use: 622
Total Peak Parking Space Demand based on Shared Parking: 546
Parking Spaces Proposed: 460
Parking Surplus/(Deficit): (86)

Time	Retail	Restaurant	Office	Residential	Total
6:00 AM	0	22	0	461	483
7:00 AM	5	32	3	415	455
8:00 AM	10	55	10	392	467
9:00 AM	22	79	13	369	483
10:00 AM	28	102	14	346	490
11:00 AM	33	108	16	323	480
12:00 PM	37	100	14	300	451
1:00 PM	37	91	13	323	464
2:00 PM	36	68	10	323	437
3:00 PM	34	42	6	323	405
4:00 PM	28	52	3	346	429
5:00 PM	25	59	2	392	478
6:00 PM	27	68	1	415	511
7:00 PM	19	80	0	447	546
8:00 PM	19	59	0	452	530
9:00 PM	0	42	0	456	498
10:00 PM	0	43	0	461	504

7. Conclusion

The proposed Arlington 425 Development, which consists of three separate buildings, 225 West Campbell Street, 33 South Chestnut Avenue, and 44 South Highland Avenue, proposes a total of approximately 361 residential rental units and up to approximately 36,441 square feet of retail, office, and restaurant space. A total of 543 parking spaces will be provided in two separate garages. Access to the development is proposed from two access drives on Highland Avenue, an access drive on Campbell Street, and two access drives on Chestnut Avenue. Based on the preceding analyses and recommendations, the following conclusions have been made:

- The proposed overall development is located on the west portion of the Village of Arlington Heights's downtown district, which provides retail, entertainment, and commercial uses, and experiences high pedestrian mobility and interactivity. A residential development in this area is considered a complementary land use to further support these convenient and nearby goods and services without requiring the use of an automobile.
- Accessibility to and from the individual sites and surrounding area is enhanced by the various alternative modes of transportation serving the area, including bus transit and pedestrian and bicycle amenities.
- The amount of traffic generated by the overall proposed development will be reduced due to the alternative modes of transportation serving the area and the convenience and accessibility of nearby goods and services.
- The development-generated traffic can be accommodated without significant impact to the external roadway system. All of the intersections within the study limits are generally projected to operate at current levels of service with the addition of the subject development-generated traffic and regional growth in traffic.
- All-way stop sign control should be considered for the intersections of Highland Avenue with Campbell Street and Sigwalt Street. Both Sigwalt Street traffic and Campbell Street traffic is currently under freeflow conditions.
- The proposed access off Campbell Street will not conflict with the turning movements with the four access drives intersecting Campbell Street from the north, east of the proposed access drive. Traffic counts show that there are low volumes of traffic turning to/from these access drives during peak hours.
- A review of projected peak hour traffic volumes shows that an all-way stop sign control is not warranted on Chestnut Avenue at its intersections with Campbell Street or Sigwalt Street.

- The site will include an internal access driveway that will provide access to Highland Avenue, Chestnut Avenue, and Campbell Street. This internal access drive will allow for a majority of traffic functions (i.e. access to the parking garage, truck/refuse deliveries, drop-off/pick-up of pedestrians, etc.) to occur on-site, thereby limiting through traffic operations on the surrounding roadway network.
- The proposed access drives off Chestnut Avenue will have a low impact on the traffic and parking operations along Chestnut Avenue between Campbell Street and Sigwalt Street. The northerly access drive will be an exit only access and will be physically restricted to exiting right-turns only. Further, the proposed full access drive to the south will only serve the private parking garage for the proposed 33 South Chestnut Avenue residential building.
- In conjunction with the proposed development, Chestnut Avenue will be widened approximately eight feet on the east side of the roadway along the site frontage to accommodate approximately ten on-street parking spaces. The proposed widening will improve through traffic flow for both directions of travel on Chestnut Avenue since currently northbound vehicles must yield to opposing southbound vehicles when there is a parked vehicle on the east side of the roadway.
- The proposed southerly access drive off Highland Avenue in alignment with the southerly garage ramp on the east side of Highland Avenue will be restricted to resident use only and will have a low impact on the through traffic operations along Highland Avenue, as well as the garage parking and ramp operations.
- Existing high-visibility crosswalks should be restriped due to weathering/fading.
- High-visibility crosswalks are recommended across the driveway approach to each of the access drives proposed.
- The standard crosswalks on the east and south legs of the Chestnut Avenue/Wing Street intersection should be restriped as high-visibility crosswalks.
- High-visibility crosswalks should be provided on all four approaches of the Chestnut Avenue/Sigwalt Street intersection. There are no existing crosswalks at this intersection.
- The proposed access drives on Highland Avenue will have limited impact on the traffic and parking operations along Highland Avenue and to the public parking garage ramps on the east side of Highland Avenue.
- Visual warning devices should be provided at garage access drives to warn pedestrians of exiting traffic.
- Based on industry standards and a comparison to existing transit-oriented developments in the regional area, the proposed 543 parking spaces are adequate to accommodate the proposed development.

- The shared parking analysis indicates that the 543 parking spaces are adequate to accommodate peak parking demands throughout the day based on the application of either the Village Code or ITE industry standards.

Appendix

Site Plan
Site Traffic Assignment Figures
Autoturn and Sight Distance Exhibits
Traffic Counts
ITE – ULI Vehicle Trip/Parking Rates
Capacity Analysis

Site Plan

CLIENT

CCH LLC
838 BUSSE HIGHWAY
PARK RIDGE, IL 60068

PROJECT

ARLINGTON 425
ARLINGTON HEIGHTS, ILLINOIS
MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT

DRAWING TITLE

ARCHITECTURAL
SITE PLAN

FILE NAME 3883-24P Site Plan
DRAWN BY RDL DATE 11.13.18


NO.	REVISED PER	DATE	BY
1	TRUCK TURNING REQ.	11.21.18	RDL
2	DESIGN DEVELOPMENT	11.27.18	RDL
3	DESIGN DEVELOPMENT	11.30.18	RDL
4	PRELIM D.C. MEETING	12.17.18	RDL
5	DESIGN DEVELOPMENT	12.20.18	RDL
6	DC & PC SUBMITTALS	1.14.19	RDL
7	REVISED PC SUBMITTAL	2.18.19	RDL
8	REVISED DC SUBMITTAL	3.1.19	RDL
9	REVISED PC SUBMITTAL	3.11.19	RDL

JOB NO. 388315

SHEET NO.
OF 13

CS

PROFESSIONAL DESIGN FIRM LICENSE #184-002934



ARLINGTON 425: ARCHITECTURAL SITE PLAN

SCALE: 1" = 30'-0"

ARLINGTON 425


A NEW B-5 DISTRICT PUD DEVELOPMENT PRESENTED BY:
CCH LLC * 838 BUSSE HIGHWAY * PARK RIDGE, ILLINOIS

DRAWING INDEX

CS	COVER SHEET AND ARCHITECTURAL SITE PLAN
CP-1	CONTEXTUAL SITE PLAN
HL-1	44 S. HIGHLAND BUILDING FLOOR PLANS
HL-2	44 S. HIGHLAND BUILDING FLOOR PLANS
HL-3	44 S. HIGHLAND BUILDING ELEVATIONS
HL-4	44 S. HIGHLAND BUILDING ELEVATIONS
HL-5	44 S. HIGHLAND BUILDING SECTIONS
CA-1	225 W. CAMPBELL BUILDING FLOOR PLANS
CA-2	225 W. CAMPBELL BUILDING FLOOR PLANS
CA-3	225 W. CAMPBELL BUILDING ELEVATIONS
CA-4	225 W. CAMPBELL BUILDING ELEVATIONS
CH-1	33 S. CHESTNUT BUILDING FLOOR PLANS
CH-2	33 S. CHESTNUT BUILDING ELEVATIONS

© COPYRIGHT 2019 TINAGLIA ARCHITECTS, INC.

Site Traffic Assignment Figures





ARLINGTON 425 DEVELOPMENT
ARLINGTON HEIGHTS, ILLINOIS


ESTIMATED SITE-GENERATED TRAFFIC ASSIGNMENT
(RESIDENTIAL USES)



Job No: 18-127 Figure: 7A



Autoturn and Sight Distance Exhibits



DESIGN VEHICLE

19.00

3.00 11.00


Passenger Vehicle

Width	: 7.00
Track	: 6.00
Lock to Lock Time	: 6.0
Steering Angle	: 31.6

- Body of Vehicle

- Front Tires Path

- Rear Tires Path



DESIGN VEHICLE

Passenger Vehicle

Width : 7.00

Track : 6.00


Lock to Lock Time : 6.0


Steering Angle : 31.6

— Body of Vehicle

— Front Tires Path

— Rear Tires Path





ARLINGTON 425
DEVELOPMENT
ARLINGTON HEIGHTS, ILLINOIS



OUTBOUND SINGLE UNIT TRUCK MANEUVERS

A - 11

DRAWN: MD
DATE: 08-16-18
PROJECT # 18-127
FIGURE: B2

CHECKED: WW
REV: 03-14-19

KLOA
Kenig, Lindgren, O'Hara, Aboona, Inc.



DESIGN VEHICLE

SU-30

Width	: 8.00
Track	: 8.00
Lock to Lock Time	: 6.0
Steering Angle	: 31.8

— Body of Vehicle
— Front Tires Path
— Rear Tires Path


ARLINGTON 425
DEVELOPMENT
ARLINGTON HEIGHTS, ILLINOIS


OUTBOUND SINGLE UNIT TRUCK MANEUVERS

DRAWN: MD
DATE: 08-16-18
PROJECT # 18-127
FIGURE: B3

CHECKED: WW
REV: 03-14-19







DESIGN VEHICLE

Arlington Hts FT Tower 131

Width	: 8.50
Track	: 8.00
Lock to Lock Time	: 6.0
Steering Angle	: 40.0

- Body of Vehicle
- Front Tires Path
- Rear Tires Path



DESIGN VEHICLE


Arlington Hts FT
Tower 131

Width	: 8.50
Track	: 8.00
Lock to Lock Time	: 6.0
Steering Angle	: 40.0


— Body of Vehicle

— Front Tires Path

— Rear Tires Path




DESIGN VEHICLE




Arlington Hts FT
Tower 131

Width	: 8.50
Track	: 8.00
Lock to Lock Time	: 6.0
Steering Angle	: 40.0

— Body of Vehicle
 — Front Tires Path
 — Rear Tires Path



DESIGN VEHICLE




Arlington Hts FT
Tower 131


Width	: 8.50
Track	: 8.00
Lock to Lock Time	: 6.0
Steering Angle	: 40.0

— Body of Vehicle

— Front Tires Path

— Rear Tires Path






DESIGN VEHICLE

Wayne Royal GT16

Width	: 8.00
Track	: 8.04
Lock to Lock Time	: 6.0
Steering Angle	: 48.0

- Body of Vehicle
- Front Tires Path
- Rear Tires Path



ARLINGTON 425
DEVELOPMENT
ARLINGTON HEIGHTS, ILLINOIS


OUTBOUND GARBAGE TRUCK MANEUVERS


A - 18

DRAWN: MD
DATE: 08-16-18
PROJECT # 18-127
FIGURE: D2

CHECKED: WW
REV: 03-14-19

KLOA
Kenig, Lindgren, O'Hara, Aboona, Inc.





DESIGN VEHICLE

Custom Medium Truck

Width : 7.12

Track : 7.12


Lock to Lock Time : 6.0

Steering Angle : 40.0

— Body of Vehicle


— Front Tires Path

— Rear Tires Path



 - NO PARKING ZONES
 LOSS OF 8 SPACES

 NOTE: 150' IS FOR A LOCAL STREET AND PER VILLAGE CODE (ORD. NO. 88-095, AUGUST 15, 1988)



SCALE: 1" = 40'

CAMPBELL STREET

HIGHLAND AVENUE

* 150' STOPPING SIGHT DISTANCE (PASSENGER VEHICLE)

* 150' STOPPING SIGHT DISTANCE (PASSENGER VEHICLE)

 - NO PARKING ZONES
LOSS OF 5 SPACES

* NOTE: 150' IS FOR A LOCAL STREET AND PER VILLAGE CODE (ORD. NO. 88-095, AUGUST 15, 1988)

ARLINGTON 425
ARLINGTON HEIGHTS, ILLINOIS

SIGHT DISTANCE STUDY ALONG HIGHLAND AVENUE

DRAWN: MD
DATE: 02-19-19
PROJECT # 18-127
FIGURE: G

CHECKED: LA
REV: 03-14-19



Traffic Counts



Kenig, Lindgren, O'Hara, Aboona, Inc.
9575 W. Higgins Rd., Suite 400

Rosemont, Illinois, United States 60018
(847)518-9990

Count Name: Campbell Street and Highland Avenue
Site Code:
Start Date: 06/26/2018
Page No: 1

Turning Movement Data

Start Time	Campbell Street Eastbound					Campbell Street Westbound					Highland Avenue Northbound				
	U-Turn	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Right	Peds	Int. Total
7:00 AM	0	9	11	0	20	0	0	15	1	15	0	8	5	4	48
7:15 AM	0	17	8	0	25	0	0	14	3	14	0	7	8	3	54
7:30 AM	0	20	13	0	33	0	2	16	5	18	0	7	4	1	62
7:45 AM	0	27	17	0	44	0	3	18	4	21	0	6	4	2	75
Hourly Total	0	73	49	0	122	0	5	63	13	68	0	28	21	10	239
8:00 AM	0	22	8	0	30	1	1	16	3	18	0	3	5	1	56
8:15 AM	0	39	13	0	52	0	4	18	1	22	0	8	8	0	90
8:30 AM	0	38	5	0	43	0	4	17	1	21	0	6	12	3	82
8:45 AM	0	41	10	0	51	0	3	16	2	19	0	1	14	5	85
Hourly Total	0	140	36	0	176	1	12	67	7	80	0	18	39	9	313
*** BREAK ***	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
4:00 PM	0	37	5	1	42	0	6	30	3	36	0	5	9	6	92
4:15 PM	0	40	5	2	45	4	1	22	2	27	0	2	5	5	79
4:30 PM	0	38	6	0	44	0	3	40	0	43	0	2	9	6	98
4:45 PM	0	36	12	3	48	3	3	24	0	30	0	2	7	3	87
Hourly Total	0	151	28	6	179	7	13	116	5	136	0	11	30	20	356
5:00 PM	0	36	7	0	43	0	10	38	3	48	0	8	17	5	116
5:15 PM	0	23	7	0	30	0	10	35	2	45	0	6	16	0	97
5:30 PM	0	36	6	0	42	0	9	31	1	40	0	10	18	1	110
5:45 PM	0	43	8	1	51	1	18	16	5	35	0	7	9	8	102
Hourly Total	0	138	28	1	166	1	47	120	11	168	0	31	60	14	425
Grand Total	0	502	141	7	643	9	77	366	36	452	0	88	150	53	1333
Approach %	0.0	78.1	21.9	-	-	2.0	17.0	81.0	-	-	0.0	37.0	63.0	-	-
Total %	0.0	37.7	10.6	-	48.2	0.7	5.8	27.5	-	33.9	0.0	6.6	11.3	-	17.9
Lights	0	500	140	-	640	9	75	356	-	440	0	87	147	-	234
% Lights	-	99.6	99.3	-	99.5	100.0	97.4	97.3	-	97.3	-	98.9	98.0	-	98.6
Buses	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	1	-	1	0	1	0	-	2
% Buses	-	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	-	0.2	-	1.1	0.0	-	0.4
Single-Unit Trucks	0	0	1	-	1	0	0	4	-	4	0	0	0	-	5
% Single-Unit Trucks	-	0.0	0.7	-	0.2	0.0	0.0	1.1	-	0.9	-	0.0	0.0	-	0.4
Articulated Trucks	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	1	-	1	0	0	0	-	1
% Articulated Trucks	-	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	-	0.2	-	0.0	0.0	-	0.1
Bicycles on Road	0	2	0	-	2	0	2	4	-	6	0	0	3	-	11
% Bicycles on Road	-	0.4	0.0	-	0.3	0.0	2.6	1.1	-	1.3	-	0.0	2.0	-	0.8
Pedestrians	-	-	-	7	-	-	-	-	36	-	-	-	-	53	-
% Pedestrians	-	-	-	100.0	-	-	-	-	100.0	-	-	-	-	100.0	-



Kenig, Lindgren, O'Hara, Aboona, Inc.
9575 W. Higgins Rd., Suite 400

Rosemont, Illinois, United States 60018
(847)518-9990

Count Name: Campbell Street and Highland Avenue
Site Code:
Start Date: 06/26/2018
Page No.: 2

Turning Movement Peak Hour Data (8:00 AM)

Start Time	Campbell Street Eastbound					Campbell Street Westbound					Highland Avenue Northbound				
	U-Turn	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Right	Peds	Int. Total
8:00 AM	0	22	8	0	30	1	1	16	3	18	0	3	5	1	56
8:15 AM	0	39	13	0	52	0	4	18	1	22	0	8	8	0	16
8:30 AM	0	38	5	0	43	0	4	17	1	21	0	6	12	3	18
8:45 AM	0	41	10	0	51	0	3	16	2	19	0	1	14	5	15
Total	0	140	36	0	176	1	12	67	7	80	0	18	39	9	313
Approach %	0.0	79.5	20.5	-	-	1.3	15.0	83.8	-	-	0.0	31.6	68.4	-	-
Total %	0.0	44.7	11.5	-	56.2	0.3	3.8	21.4	-	25.6	0.0	5.8	12.5	-	18.2
PHF	0.000	0.854	0.692	-	0.846	0.250	0.750	0.931	-	0.909	0.000	0.563	0.696	-	0.792
Lights	0	140	35	-	175	1	12	63	-	76	0	18	39	-	57
% Lights	-	100.0	97.2	-	99.4	100.0	100.0	94.0	-	95.0	-	100.0	100.0	-	100.0
Buses	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	1	-	1	0	0	0	-	0
% Buses	-	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.5	-	1.3	-	0.0	0.0	-	0.0
Single-Unit Trucks	0	0	1	-	1	0	0	2	-	2	0	0	0	-	0
% Single-Unit Trucks	-	0.0	2.8	-	0.6	0.0	0.0	3.0	-	2.5	-	0.0	0.0	-	0.0
Articulated Trucks	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	-	0
% Articulated Trucks	-	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	-	0.0
Bicycles on Road	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	1	-	1	0	0	0	-	1
% Bicycles on Road	-	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.5	-	1.3	-	0.0	0.0	-	0.0
Pedestrians	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	7	-	-	-	-	9	-
% Pedestrians	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100.0	-	-	-	-	100.0	-



Kenig Lindgren O'Hara Aboona, Inc.
9575 W. Higgins Rd., Suite 400

Rosemont, Illinois, United States 60018
(847)518-9990

Count Name: Campbell Street and Highland Avenue
Site Code:
Start Date: 06/26/2018
Page No: 3

Turning Movement Peak Hour Data (5:00 PM)

Start Time	Campbell Street Eastbound					Campbell Street Westbound					Highland Avenue Northbound				
	U-Turn	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Right	Peds	Int. Total
5:00 PM	0	36	7	0	43	0	10	38	3	48	0	8	17	5	116
5:15 PM	0	23	7	0	30	0	10	35	2	45	0	6	16	0	97
5:30 PM	0	36	6	0	42	0	9	31	1	40	0	10	18	1	110
5:45 PM	0	43	8	1	51	1	18	16	5	35	0	7	9	8	102
Total	0	138	28	1	166	1	47	120	11	168	0	31	60	14	425
Approach %	0.0	83.1	16.9	-	-	0.6	28.0	71.4	-	-	0.0	34.1	65.9	-	-
Total %	0.0	32.5	6.6	-	39.1	0.2	11.1	28.2	-	39.5	0.0	7.3	14.1	-	21.4
PHF	0.000	0.802	0.875	-	0.814	0.250	0.653	0.789	-	0.875	0.000	0.775	0.833	-	0.916
Lights	0	137	28	-	165	1	45	120	-	166	0	31	60	-	422
% Lights	-	99.3	100.0	-	99.4	100.0	95.7	100.0	-	98.8	-	100.0	100.0	-	99.3
Buses	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	-	0
% Buses	-	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	-	0.0
Single-Unit Trucks	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	-	0
% Single-Unit Trucks	-	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	-	0.0
Articulated Trucks	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	-	0
% Articulated Trucks	-	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	-	0.0
Bicycles on Road	0	1	0	-	1	0	2	0	-	2	0	0	0	-	3
% Bicycles on Road	-	0.7	0.0	-	0.6	0.0	4.3	0.0	-	1.2	-	0.0	0.0	-	0.7
Pedestrians	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	11	-	-	-	-	14	-
% Pedestrians	-	-	-	100.0	-	-	-	-	100.0	-	-	-	-	100.0	-



Kenig Lindgren O'Hara Aboona, Inc.
9575 W. Higgins Rd., Suite 400

Rosemont, Illinois, United States 60018
(847)518-9990

Count Name: Campbell St and Chestnut Ave
Site Code:
Start Date: 08/08/2017
Page No: 1

Turning Movement Data

Start Time	Campbell Ave Eastbound					Campbell St Westbound					Chestnut Ave Northbound					Chestnut Ave Southbound					App. Total	Int. Total			
	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left			Thru	Right	Peds
7:00 AM	0	4	24	0	0	28	0	0	24	2	3	26	0	0	1	2	3	3	0	0	5	2	2	7	64
7:15 AM	0	2	24	1	0	27	0	0	18	3	2	21	0	0	2	0	3	2	0	2	4	1	3	7	57
7:30 AM	0	5	26	0	1	31	0	0	22	2	1	24	0	1	1	0	0	2	0	1	3	2	5	6	63
7:45 AM	0	0	43	5	3	48	0	1	25	2	4	28	0	2	4	0	2	6	0	0	4	1	5	5	87
Hourly Total	0	11	117	6	4	134	0	1	89	9	10	99	0	3	8	2	8	13	0	3	16	6	15	25	271
8:00 AM	0	2	34	1	1	37	0	1	25	1	1	27	0	0	1	0	2	1	0	2	1	2	1	5	70
8:15 AM	0	3	38	1	1	42	0	0	28	2	3	30	0	2	0	0	1	2	0	2	2	2	3	6	80
8:30 AM	0	6	38	1	1	45	0	1	28	1	0	30	0	1	1	0	2	2	0	1	2	2	1	5	82
8:45 AM	0	2	43	3	1	48	0	0	26	2	2	28	0	1	2	2	2	5	0	1	0	2	2	3	84
Hourly Total	0	13	153	6	4	172	0	2	107	6	6	115	0	4	4	2	7	10	0	6	5	8	7	19	316
*** BREAK ***	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
4:00 PM	0	7	53	0	2	60	0	0	29	1	1	30	0	3	0	0	5	3	0	1	2	6	0	9	102
4:15 PM	0	4	35	0	1	39	0	0	38	2	1	40	0	6	1	0	0	7	0	0	2	7	2	9	95
4:30 PM	0	6	24	0	1	30	1	2	30	5	0	38	0	2	2	0	2	4	0	3	1	6	0	10	82
4:45 PM	0	3	33	4	0	40	0	0	31	2	0	33	0	2	2	3	2	7	0	1	3	3	2	7	87
Hourly Total	0	20	145	4	4	169	1	2	128	10	2	141	0	13	5	3	9	21	0	5	8	22	4	35	366
5:00 PM	0	2	40	3	0	45	0	0	34	0	0	34	0	4	2	2	2	8	0	1	1	9	2	11	98
5:15 PM	0	7	41	2	0	50	2	2	26	3	0	33	0	4	2	0	0	6	0	1	1	5	0	7	96
5:30 PM	0	5	29	4	0	38	1	5	35	6	2	47	0	4	1	2	4	7	0	5	2	3	4	10	102
5:45 PM	0	6	50	3	1	59	2	1	31	3	4	37	0	2	8	3	6	13	0	3	4	2	10	9	118
Hourly Total	0	20	160	12	1	192	5	8	126	12	6	151	0	14	13	7	12	34	0	10	8	19	16	37	414
Grand Total	0	64	575	28	13	667	6	13	450	37	24	506	0	34	30	14	36	78	0	24	37	55	42	116	1367
Approach %	0.0	9.6	86.2	4.2	-	-	1.2	2.6	88.9	7.3	-	-	0.0	43.6	38.5	17.9	-	-	0.0	20.7	31.9	47.4	-	-	-
Total %	0.0	4.7	42.1	2.0	-	48.8	0.4	1.0	32.9	2.7	-	37.0	0.0	2.5	2.2	1.0	-	5.7	0.0	1.8	2.7	4.0	-	8.5	-
Lights	0	60	564	27	-	651	6	13	440	35	-	494	0	34	27	13	-	74	0	24	34	53	-	111	1330
% Lights	-	93.8	98.1	96.4	-	97.6	100.0	100.0	97.8	94.6	-	97.6	-	100.0	90.0	92.9	-	94.9	-	100.0	91.9	96.4	-	95.7	97.3
Buses	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	2	0	-	2	0	0	0	0	-	0	2
% Buses	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	6.7	0.0	-	2.6	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.1
Single-Unit Trucks	0	0	7	0	-	7	0	0	5	2	-	7	0	0	1	1	-	2	0	0	1	2	-	3	19
% Single-Unit Trucks	-	0.0	1.2	0.0	-	1.0	0.0	0.0	1.1	5.4	-	1.4	-	0.0	3.3	7.1	-	2.6	-	0.0	2.7	3.6	-	2.6	1.4
Articulated Trucks	0	1	1	0	-	2	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	2
% Articulated Trucks	-	1.6	0.2	0.0	-	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.1
Bicycles on Road	0	3	3	1	-	7	0	0	5	0	-	5	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	2	0	-	2	14
% Bicycles on Road	-	4.7	0.5	3.6	-	1.0	0.0	0.0	1.1	0.0	-	1.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	5.4	0.0	-	1.7	1.0
Pedestrians	-	-	-	-	13	-	-	-	-	-	24	-	-	-	-	-	-	36	-	-	-	-	42	-	-



Kenig Lindgren O'Hara Aboona, Inc.
9575 W. Higgins Rd., Suite 400

Rosemont, Illinois, United States 60018
(847)518-9990

Count Name: Campbell St and Chestnut Ave
Site Code:
Start Date: 08/08/2017
Page No.: 3

Turning Movement Peak Hour Data (8:00 AM)

Start Time	Campbell Ave Eastbound						Campbell St Westbound						Chestnut Ave Northbound						Chestnut Ave Southbound					
	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total
8:00 AM	0	2	34	1	1	37	0	1	25	1	1	27	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	2	1	2	1	5
8:15 AM	0	3	38	1	1	42	0	0	28	2	3	30	0	2	0	0	0	1	2	2	2	2	3	6
8:30 AM	0	6	38	1	1	45	0	1	28	1	0	30	0	1	1	0	0	2	0	1	2	2	1	5
8:45 AM	0	2	43	3	1	48	0	0	26	2	2	28	0	1	2	2	2	5	0	1	0	2	2	3
Total	0	13	153	6	4	172	0	2	107	6	6	115	0	4	4	2	7	10	0	6	5	8	7	19
Approach %	0.0	7.6	89.0	3.5	-	-	0.0	1.7	93.0	5.2	-	-	0.0	40.0	40.0	20.0	-	-	0.0	31.6	26.3	42.1	-	-
Total %	0.0	4.1	48.4	1.9	-	54.4	0.0	0.6	33.9	1.9	-	36.4	0.0	1.3	1.3	0.6	-	3.2	0.0	1.9	1.6	2.5	-	6.0
PHF	0.000	0.542	0.890	0.500	-	0.896	0.000	0.500	0.955	0.750	-	0.958	0.000	0.500	0.500	0.250	-	0.500	0.000	0.750	0.625	1.000	-	0.792
Lights	0	13	151	6	-	170	0	2	104	5	-	111	0	4	4	2	-	10	0	6	5	7	-	18
% Lights	-	100.0	98.7	100.0	-	98.8	-	100.0	97.2	83.3	-	96.5	-	100.0	100.0	100.0	-	100.0	-	100.0	100.0	87.5	-	94.7
Buses	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0
% Buses	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0
Single-Unit Trucks	0	0	2	0	-	2	0	0	3	1	-	4	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	1	-	1
% Single-Unit Trucks	-	0.0	1.3	0.0	-	1.2	-	0.0	2.8	16.7	-	3.5	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	12.5	-	5.3
Articulated Trucks	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0
% Articulated Trucks	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0
Bicycles on Road	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0
% Bicycles on Road	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0
Pedestrians	-	-	-	-	4	-	-	-	-	-	6	-	-	-	-	-	7	-	-	-	-	-	7	-
% Pedestrians	-	-	-	-	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	100.0	-



Kenig, Lindgren, O'Hara, Aboona, Inc.
9575 W. Higgins Rd., Suite 400

Rosemont, Illinois, United States 60018
(847)518-9990

Count Name: Campbell St and Chestnut Ave
Site Code:
Start Date: 08/08/2017
Page No: 4

Turning Movement Peak Hour Data (5:00 PM)

Start Time	Campbell Ave Eastbound						Campbell St Westbound						Chestnut Ave Northbound						Chestnut Ave Southbound						
	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	Int. Total
5:00 PM	0	2	40	3	0	45	0	0	34	0	0	34	0	4	2	2	2	8	0	1	1	9	2	11	98
5:15 PM	0	7	41	2	0	50	2	2	26	3	0	33	0	4	2	0	0	6	0	1	1	5	0	7	96
5:30 PM	0	5	29	4	0	38	1	5	35	6	2	47	0	4	1	2	4	7	0	5	2	3	4	10	102
5:45 PM	0	6	50	3	1	59	2	1	31	3	4	37	0	2	8	3	6	13	0	3	4	2	10	9	118
Total	0	20	160	12	1	192	5	8	126	12	6	151	0	14	13	7	12	34	0	10	8	19	16	37	414
Approach %	0.0	10.4	83.3	6.3	-	-	3.3	5.3	83.4	7.9	-	-	0.0	41.2	38.2	20.6	-	-	0.0	27.0	21.6	51.4	-	-	-
Total %	0.0	4.8	38.6	2.9	-	46.4	1.2	1.9	30.4	2.9	-	36.5	0.0	3.4	3.1	1.7	-	8.2	0.0	2.4	1.9	4.6	-	8.9	-
PHF	0.000	0.714	0.800	0.750	-	0.814	0.625	0.400	0.900	0.500	-	0.803	0.000	0.875	0.406	0.583	-	0.654	0.000	0.500	0.500	0.528	-	0.841	0.877
Lights	0	20	157	11	-	188	5	8	123	12	-	148	0	14	13	7	-	34	0	10	6	19	-	35	405
% Lights	-	100.0	98.1	91.7	-	97.9	100.0	100.0	97.6	100.0	-	98.0	-	100.0	100.0	100.0	-	100.0	-	100.0	75.0	100.0	-	94.6	97.8
Buses	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0
% Buses	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0
Single-Unit Trucks	0	0	2	0	-	2	0	0	1	0	-	1	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	3
% Single-Unit Trucks	-	0.0	1.3	0.0	-	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.8	0.0	-	0.7	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.7
Articulated Trucks	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0
% Articulated Trucks	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0
Bicycles on Road	0	0	1	1	-	2	0	0	2	0	-	2	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	2	0	-	2	6
% Bicycles on Road	-	0.0	0.6	8.3	-	1.0	0.0	0.0	1.6	0.0	-	1.3	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	25.0	0.0	-	5.4	1.4
Pedestrians	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	6	-	-	-	-	-	12	-	-	-	-	-	16	-	-
% Pedestrians	-	-	-	-	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	100.0	-	-



Kenig Lindgren O'Hara Aboona, Inc.
9575 W. Higgins Rd., Suite 400
Rosemont, Illinois, United States 60018
(847)518-9990

Count Name: Sigwalt Street and Highland Avenue
Site Code:
Start Date: 06/26/2018
Page No: 1

Turning Movement Data

Start Time	Sigwalt Street Eastbound					App. Total	Sigwalt Street Westbound					Highland Avenue Northbound					Highland Avenue Southbound					App. Total	Int. Total		
	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds		U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds				
7:00 AM	0	9	30	1	4	40	0	4	35	5	1	44	0	0	6	3	0	9	0	3	1	2	4	6	99
7:15 AM	0	5	28	0	0	33	0	1	21	2	0	24	0	0	2	2	0	4	0	6	0	2	1	8	69
7:30 AM	0	7	31	0	1	38	0	2	20	7	0	29	0	1	2	2	0	5	0	7	2	3	0	12	84
7:45 AM	0	10	16	1	2	27	0	2	29	3	2	34	0	1	8	3	0	12	0	7	0	1	0	8	81
Hourly Total	0	31	105	2	7	138	0	9	105	17	3	131	0	2	18	10	0	30	0	23	3	8	5	34	333
8:00 AM	0	0	25	2	1	27	0	1	14	3	0	18	0	3	3	3	0	9	0	3	1	2	2	6	60
8:15 AM	0	2	23	0	0	25	0	3	28	7	0	38	0	2	5	1	0	8	0	4	2	1	0	7	78
8:30 AM	0	2	26	0	0	28	0	1	26	9	0	36	0	2	2	4	0	8	0	8	2	1	0	11	83
8:45 AM	0	0	32	2	1	34	0	8	36	9	0	53	0	8	5	15	0	28	0	5	3	1	0	9	124
Hourly Total	0	4	106	4	2	114	0	13	104	28	0	145	0	15	15	23	0	53	0	20	8	5	2	33	345
*** BREAK ***	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
4:00 PM	0	0	25	1	2	26	0	3	41	4	0	48	0	0	5	3	0	8	0	5	3	0	0	8	90
4:15 PM	0	1	25	1	3	27	0	2	30	3	0	35	0	0	1	2	0	3	0	2	2	0	2	4	69
4:30 PM	0	0	32	0	0	32	0	0	38	3	2	41	0	1	1	5	0	7	0	6	2	4	2	12	92
4:45 PM	0	2	29	1	2	32	0	0	42	6	0	48	0	0	5	7	0	12	0	2	0	2	0	4	96
Hourly Total	0	3	111	3	7	117	0	5	151	16	2	172	0	1	12	17	0	30	0	15	7	6	4	28	347
5:00 PM	0	0	28	2	2	30	0	2	48	4	0	54	0	1	3	1	0	5	0	6	6	5	2	17	106
5:15 PM	0	2	29	3	1	34	0	1	28	3	0	32	0	1	7	2	0	10	0	7	4	5	0	16	92
5:30 PM	0	3	25	0	2	28	0	2	48	4	0	54	0	0	4	1	0	5	0	13	8	13	1	34	121
5:45 PM	0	5	26	1	1	32	0	2	43	5	0	50	0	2	2	7	0	11	0	7	7	3	2	17	110
Hourly Total	0	10	108	6	6	124	0	7	167	16	0	190	0	4	16	11	0	31	0	33	25	26	5	84	429
Grand Total	0	48	430	15	22	493	0	34	527	77	5	638	0	22	61	61	0	144	0	91	43	45	16	179	1454
Approach %	0.0	9.7	87.2	3.0	-	-	0.0	5.3	82.6	12.1	-	-	0.0	15.3	42.4	42.4	-	-	0.0	50.8	24.0	25.1	-	-	-
Total %	0.0	3.3	29.6	1.0	-	33.9	0.0	2.3	36.2	5.3	-	43.9	0.0	1.5	4.2	4.2	-	9.9	0.0	6.3	3.0	3.1	-	12.3	-
Lights	0	48	421	14	-	483	0	31	516	77	-	624	0	22	57	60	-	139	-	90	40	45	-	175	1421
% Lights	-	100.0	97.9	93.3	-	98.0	-	91.2	97.9	100.0	-	97.8	-	100.0	93.4	98.4	-	96.5	-	98.9	93.0	100.0	-	97.8	97.7
Buses	0	0	1	0	-	1	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	1	0	-	1	0	0	0	0	-	0	2
% Buses	-	0.0	0.2	0.0	-	0.2	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	1.6	0.0	-	0.7	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.1
Single-Unit Trucks	0	0	6	0	-	6	0	0	7	0	-	7	0	0	0	1	-	1	0	1	0	0	-	1	15
% Single-Unit Trucks	-	0.0	1.4	0.0	-	1.2	-	0.0	1.3	0.0	-	1.1	-	0.0	0.0	1.6	-	0.7	-	1.1	0.0	0.0	-	0.6	1.0
Articulated Trucks	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	3	0	-	3	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	3
% Articulated Trucks	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.6	0.0	-	0.5	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.2
Bicycles on Road	0	0	2	1	-	3	0	3	1	0	-	4	0	0	3	0	-	3	0	0	3	0	-	3	13
% Bicycles on Road	-	0.0	0.5	6.7	-	0.6	-	8.8	0.2	0.0	-	0.6	-	0.0	4.9	0.0	-	2.1	-	0.0	7.0	0.0	-	1.7	0.9
Pedestrians	-	-	-	-	22	-	-	-	-	-	5	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	16	-	-



Kenig Lindgren O'Hara Aboona, Inc.
9575 W. Higgins Rd., Suite 400
Rosemont, Illinois, United States 60018
(847)518-9990

Count Name: Sigwalt Street and Highland Avenue
Site Code:
Start Date: 06/26/2018
Page No.: 3

Turning Movement Peak Hour Data (8:00 AM)

Start Time	Sigwalt Street Eastbound						Sigwalt Street Westbound						Highland Avenue Northbound						Highland Avenue Southbound						App. Total	Int. Total
	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total		
8:00 AM	0	0	25	2	1	27	0	1	14	3	0	18	0	3	3	3	3	0	9	0	3	1	2	2	6	60
8:15 AM	0	2	23	0	0	25	0	3	28	7	0	38	0	2	5	1	0	8	0	4	2	1	0	7	78	
8:30 AM	0	2	26	0	0	28	0	1	26	9	0	36	0	2	2	4	0	8	0	8	2	1	0	11	83	
8:45 AM	0	0	32	2	1	34	0	8	36	9	0	53	0	8	5	15	0	28	0	5	3	1	0	9	124	
Total	0	4	106	4	2	114	0	13	104	28	0	145	0	15	15	23	0	53	0	20	8	5	2	33	345	
Approach %	0.0	3.5	93.0	3.5	-	-	0.0	9.0	71.7	19.3	-	-	0.0	28.3	28.3	43.4	-	-	0.0	60.6	24.2	15.2	-	-	-	
Total %	0.0	1.2	30.7	1.2	-	33.0	0.0	3.8	30.1	8.1	-	42.0	0.0	4.3	4.3	6.7	-	15.4	0.0	5.8	2.3	1.4	-	-	9.6	
PHF	0.000	0.500	0.828	0.500	-	0.838	0.000	0.406	0.722	0.778	-	0.684	0.000	0.469	0.750	0.383	-	0.473	0.000	0.625	0.667	0.625	-	-	0.750	
Lights	0	4	104	4	-	112	0	13	103	28	-	144	0	15	15	22	-	52	0	19	8	5	-	-	340	
% Lights	-	100.0	98.1	100.0	-	98.2	-	100.0	99.0	100.0	-	99.3	-	100.0	100.0	95.7	-	98.1	-	95.0	100.0	100.0	-	-	98.6	
Buses	0	0	1	0	-	1	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	1	
% Buses	-	0.0	0.9	0.0	-	0.9	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	-	0.3	
Single-Unit Trucks	0	0	1	0	-	1	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	1	-	1	0	1	0	0	-	-	3	
% Single-Unit Trucks	-	0.0	0.9	0.0	-	0.9	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	4.3	-	1.9	-	5.0	0.0	0.0	-	-	0.9	
Articulated Trucks	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	1	0	-	1	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	-	1	
% Articulated Trucks	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	1.0	0.0	-	0.7	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	-	0.3	
Bicycles on Road	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	-	0	
% Bicycles on Road	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	-	0.0	
Pedestrians	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	0.0	0.0	-	2	-	
% Pedestrians	-	-	-	-	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100.0	-	



Kenig Lindgren O'Hara Aboona, Inc.
9575 W. Higgins Rd., Suite 400

Rosemont, Illinois, United States 60018
(847)518-9990

Count Name: Sigwalt Street and Highland
Avenue
Site Code:
Start Date: 06/26/2018
Page No: 4

Turning Movement Peak Hour Data (5:00 PM)

Start Time	Sigwalt Street Eastbound						Sigwalt Street Westbound						Highland Avenue Northbound						Highland Avenue Southbound					
	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total
5:00 PM	0	0	28	2	2	30	0	2	48	4	0	54	0	1	3	1	0	5	0	6	6	5	2	17
5:15 PM	0	2	29	3	1	34	0	1	28	3	0	32	0	1	7	2	0	10	0	7	4	5	0	16
5:30 PM	0	3	25	0	2	28	0	2	48	4	0	54	0	0	4	1	0	5	0	13	8	13	1	34
5:45 PM	0	5	26	1	1	32	0	2	43	5	0	50	0	2	2	7	0	11	0	7	7	3	2	17
Total	0	10	108	6	6	124	0	7	167	16	0	190	0	4	16	11	0	31	0	33	25	26	5	84
Approach %	0.0	8.1	87.1	4.8	-	-	0.0	3.7	87.9	8.4	-	-	0.0	12.9	51.6	35.5	-	-	0.0	39.3	29.8	31.0	-	-
Total %	0.0	2.3	25.2	1.4	-	28.9	0.0	1.6	38.9	3.7	-	44.3	0.0	0.9	3.7	2.6	-	7.2	0.0	7.7	5.8	6.1	-	19.6
PHF	0.000	0.500	0.931	0.500	-	0.912	0.000	0.875	0.870	0.800	-	0.880	0.000	0.500	0.571	0.393	-	0.705	0.000	0.635	0.781	0.500	-	0.618
% Lights	0	10	105	6	-	121	0	7	163	16	-	186	0	4	16	11	-	31	0	33	24	26	-	83
% Single-Unit Trucks	-	100.0	97.2	100.0	-	97.6	-	100.0	97.6	100.0	-	97.9	-	100.0	100.0	100.0	-	100.0	-	100.0	98.0	100.0	-	98.8
% Buses	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0
% Single-Unit Trucks	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0
% Single-Unit Trucks	0	0	3	0	-	3	0	0	3	0	-	3	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0
% Single-Unit Trucks	-	0.0	2.8	0.0	-	2.4	-	0.0	1.8	0.0	-	1.6	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0
Articulated Trucks	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0
% Articulated Trucks	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0
Bicycles on Road	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	1	0	-	1	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	1	0	-	1
% Bicycles on Road	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.6	0.0	-	0.5	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	4.0	0.0	-	1.2
Pedestrians	-	-	-	-	6	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	5	-
% Pedestrians	-	-	-	-	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100.0	-



Kenig Lindgren O'Hara Aboona, Inc.
9575 W. Higgins Rd., Suite 400

Rosemont, Illinois, United States 60018
(847)518-9990

Count Name: Sigwalt/Chestnut
Site Code:
Start Date: 05/18/2017
Page No: 1

Turning Movement Data

Start Time	Sigwalt Street Eastbound					App. Total	Sigwalt Street Westbound					Chestnut Avenue Northbound					Chestnut Avenue Southbound					App. Total	Int. Total
	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds		U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds		
7:00 AM	0	0	58	0	0	58	0	0	26	0	1	26	0	1	0	1	2	2	5	91			
7:15 AM	0	0	29	0	0	29	0	0	14	2	1	16	0	1	0	0	3	1	1	47			
7:30 AM	0	0	53	1	0	54	0	2	30	1	0	33	0	4	4	0	1	8	97				
7:45 AM	0	1	70	0	1	71	0	0	39	3	3	42	0	0	1	1	0	2	5	120			
Hourly Total	0	1	210	1	1	212	0	2	109	6	5	117	0	2	1	4	6	7	19	355			
8:00 AM	0	2	39	1	0	42	0	0	36	2	0	38	0	1	0	1	1	2	3	85			
8:15 AM	0	0	30	1	0	31	0	2	22	3	0	27	0	1	0	1	0	2	3	63			
8:30 AM	0	0	24	2	0	26	0	0	31	2	0	33	0	0	0	1	0	1	3	63			
8:45 AM	0	1	32	0	3	33	0	1	29	3	0	33	0	0	1	0	0	1	6	73			
Hourly Total	0	3	125	4	3	132	0	3	118	10	0	131	0	2	1	3	1	6	15	284			
*** BREAK ***	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-			
4:00 PM	0	3	26	0	0	29	0	1	39	4	3	44	0	0	1	1	7	2	6	81			
4:15 PM	0	1	25	0	1	26	0	0	34	1	2	35	0	0	1	1	6	2	11	74			
4:30 PM	0	0	31	2	1	33	0	0	50	0	0	50	0	0	0	2	1	2	4	89			
4:45 PM	0	1	33	0	0	34	0	4	45	8	2	57	0	0	0	0	2	0	6	97			
Hourly Total	0	5	115	2	2	122	0	5	168	13	7	186	0	0	2	4	16	6	27	341			
5:00 PM	0	1	30	0	0	31	0	2	61	3	1	66	0	2	0	1	1	3	9	109			
5:15 PM	0	0	39	0	0	39	0	0	54	6	1	60	0	1	2	0	3	3	9	111			
5:30 PM	0	4	30	1	1	35	0	1	43	5	1	49	0	0	1	2	1	3	8	95			
5:45 PM	0	2	32	1	1	35	0	2	49	14	0	65	0	0	0	1	3	1	6	107			
Hourly Total	0	7	131	2	2	140	0	5	207	28	3	240	0	3	3	4	8	10	32	422			
Grand Total	0	16	581	9	8	606	0	15	602	57	15	674	0	7	7	15	31	29	93	1402			
Approach %	0.0	2.6	95.9	1.5	-	-	0.0	2.2	89.3	8.5	-	-	0.0	24.1	24.1	51.7	-	-	-	-			
Total %	0.0	1.1	41.4	0.6	-	43.2	0.0	1.1	42.9	4.1	-	48.1	0.0	0.5	0.5	1.1	-	2.1	6.6	-			
Lights	0	16	568	8	-	592	0	15	587	55	-	657	0	7	7	15	-	29	92	1370			
% Lights	-	100.0	97.8	88.9	-	97.7	-	100.0	97.5	96.5	-	97.5	-	100.0	100.0	100.0	-	100.0	96.4	100.0	-		
Buses	0	0	1	0	-	1	0	0	3	0	-	3	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	4			
% Buses	-	0.0	0.2	0.0	-	0.2	-	0.0	0.5	0.0	-	0.4	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.3			
Single-Unit Trucks	0	0	4	1	-	5	0	0	8	1	-	9	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	14			
% Single-Unit Trucks	-	0.0	0.7	11.1	-	0.8	-	0.0	1.3	1.8	-	1.3	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	1.0			
Articulated Trucks	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0			
% Articulated Trucks	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0			
Bicycles on Road	0	0	8	0	-	8	0	0	4	1	-	5	0	0	0	0	-	0	1	14			
% Bicycles on Road	-	0.0	1.4	0.0	-	1.3	-	0.0	0.7	1.8	-	0.7	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	3.6	0.0	-		
Pedestrians	-	-	-	-	8	-	-	-	-	-	15	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	13	-		



Kenig Lindgren O'Hara Aboona, Inc.
9575 W. Higgins Rd., Suite 400

Rosemont, Illinois, United States 60018
(847)518-9990

Count Name: Sigwalt/Chestnut
Site Code:
Start Date: 05/18/2017
Page No: 3

Turning Movement Peak Hour Data (7:30 AM)

Start Time	Sigwalt Street Eastbound						Sigwalt Street Westbound						Chestnut Avenue Northbound						Chestnut Avenue Southbound						Int. Total	
	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total		
7:30 AM	0	0	53	1	0	54	0	2	30	1	0	33	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	0	4	4	0	1	8	97
7:45 AM	0	1	70	0	1	71	0	0	39	3	3	42	0	0	1	1	1	0	2	0	2	2	1	0	5	120
8:00 AM	0	2	39	1	0	42	0	0	36	2	0	38	0	1	0	0	1	1	2	1	1	1	0	0	3	85
8:15 AM	0	0	30	1	0	31	0	2	22	3	0	27	0	1	0	1	0	2	0	1	1	1	1	0	3	63
Total	0	3	192	3	1	198	0	4	127	9	3	140	0	2	2	1	5	2	8	1	8	8	2	1	19	365
Approach %	0.0	1.5	97.0	1.5	-	-	0.0	2.9	90.7	6.4	-	-	0.0	25.0	12.5	62.5	-	-	-	5.3	42.1	42.1	10.5	-	-	-
Total %	0.0	0.8	52.6	0.8	-	54.2	0.0	1.1	34.8	2.5	-	38.4	0.0	0.5	0.3	1.4	-	2.2	0.3	2.2	2.2	0.5	-	-	5.2	
PHF	0.000	0.375	0.686	0.750	-	0.697	0.000	0.500	0.814	0.750	-	0.833	0.000	0.500	0.250	0.625	-	1.000	0.250	0.500	0.500	0.500	-	-	0.594	0.760
Lights	0	3	189	3	-	195	0	4	124	7	-	135	0	2	1	5	-	8	1	8	8	2	-	19	357	
% Lights	-	100.0	98.4	100.0	-	98.5	-	100.0	97.6	77.8	-	96.4	-	100.0	100.0	100.0	-	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	-	100.0	97.8	
Buses	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	1	0	-	1	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	1	
% Buses	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.8	0.0	-	0.7	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.3	
Single-Unit Trucks	0	0	1	0	-	1	0	0	2	1	-	3	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	4	
% Single-Unit Trucks	-	0.0	0.5	0.0	-	0.5	-	0.0	1.6	11.1	-	2.1	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	1.1	
Articulated Trucks	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	
% Articulated Trucks	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	
Bicycles on Road	0	0	2	0	-	2	0	0	0	1	-	1	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	3	
% Bicycles on Road	-	0.0	1.0	0.0	-	1.0	-	0.0	0.0	11.1	-	0.7	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.8	
Pedestrians	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	
% Pedestrians	-	-	-	-	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	100.0	-	



Kenig Lindgren O'Hara Aboona, Inc.
9575 W. Higgins Rd., Suite 400

Rosemont, Illinois, United States 60018
(847)518-9990

Count Name: Sigwalt/Chestnut
Site Code:
Start Date: 05/18/2017
Page No: 4

Turning Movement Peak Hour Data (5:00 PM)

Start Time	Sigwalt Street Eastbound						Sigwalt Street Westbound						Chestnut Avenue Northbound						Chestnut Avenue Southbound						Int. Total	
	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total		
5:00 PM	0	1	30	0	0	31	0	2	61	3	1	66	0	2	0	0	1	1	3	0	8	0	1	0	9	109
5:15 PM	0	0	39	0	0	39	0	0	54	6	1	60	0	1	2	0	3	3	3	0	2	5	2	0	9	111
5:30 PM	0	4	30	1	1	35	0	1	43	5	1	49	0	0	1	2	1	3	3	0	5	1	2	1	8	95
5:45 PM	0	2	32	1	1	35	0	2	49	14	0	65	0	0	0	1	3	1	1	0	5	1	0	1	6	107
Total	0	7	131	2	2	140	0	5	207	28	3	240	0	3	3	4	8	10	10	0	20	7	5	2	32	422
Approach %	0.0	5.0	93.6	1.4	-	-	0.0	2.1	86.3	11.7	-	-	0.0	30.0	30.0	40.0	-	-	-	0.0	62.5	21.9	15.6	-	-	-
Total %	0.0	1.7	31.0	0.5	-	33.2	0.0	1.2	49.1	6.6	-	56.9	0.0	0.7	0.7	0.9	-	2.4	0.0	4.7	1.7	1.2	-	-	7.6	-
PHF	0.000	0.438	0.840	0.500	-	0.897	0.000	0.625	0.848	0.500	-	0.909	0.000	0.375	0.375	0.500	-	0.833	0.000	0.625	0.350	0.625	-	-	0.889	0.950
Lights	0	7	126	2	-	135	0	5	201	28	-	234	-	3	3	4	-	10	-	20	6	5	-	31	410	
% Lights	-	100.0	96.2	100.0	-	96.4	-	100.0	97.1	100.0	-	97.5	-	100.0	100.0	100.0	-	100.0	-	100.0	85.7	100.0	-	96.9	97.2	
Buses	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	1	0	-	1	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	1	
% Buses	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.5	0.0	-	0.4	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.2	
Single-Unit Trucks	0	0	2	0	-	2	0	0	3	0	-	3	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	5	
% Single-Unit Trucks	-	0.0	1.5	0.0	-	1.4	-	0.0	1.4	0.0	-	1.3	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	1.2	
Articulated Trucks	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	
% Articulated Trucks	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	
Bicycles on Road	0	0	3	0	-	3	0	0	2	0	-	2	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	1	0	-	1	6	
% Bicycles on Road	-	0.0	2.3	0.0	-	2.1	-	0.0	1.0	0.0	-	0.8	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	14.3	0.0	-	3.1	1.4	
Pedestrians	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	8	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	
% Pedestrians	-	-	-	-	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	100.0	-	



Kenig, Lindgren, O'Hara, Aboona, Inc.
9575 W. Higgins Rd., Suite 400

Rosemont, Illinois, United States 60018
(847)518-9990

Count Name: Vail Avenue and Campbell Street
Site Code:
Start Date: 06/26/2018
Page No: 1

Turning Movement Data

Start Time	Campbell Street Eastbound						Campbell Street Westbound						Vail Avenue Northbound						Vail Avenue Southbound					
	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total
7:00 AM	0	8	12	1	41	21	0	4	8	1	2	13	0	1	23	1	3	25	0	4	16	2	6	22
7:15 AM	0	7	14	2	20	23	0	2	9	2	1	13	0	3	17	0	8	20	0	4	10	3	5	17
7:30 AM	0	5	12	6	27	23	0	5	14	3	4	22	0	1	16	1	4	18	0	4	26	3	3	33
7:45 AM	0	11	16	3	46	30	0	3	13	5	2	21	0	5	13	2	2	20	0	1	29	6	9	36
Hourly Total	0	31	54	12	134	97	0	14	44	11	9	69	0	10	69	4	17	83	0	13	81	14	23	108
8:00 AM	0	8	15	2	13	25	0	6	13	3	2	22	0	1	12	2	2	15	0	2	25	6	1	33
8:15 AM	0	12	24	4	19	40	0	5	12	3	3	20	0	5	12	3	6	20	0	4	25	5	4	34
8:30 AM	0	13	31	8	6	52	0	3	13	1	0	17	0	2	12	0	5	14	0	7	13	9	5	29
8:45 AM	0	18	27	11	2	56	0	4	12	4	2	20	0	1	27	1	8	29	0	5	23	7	1	35
Hourly Total	0	51	97	25	40	173	0	18	50	11	7	79	0	9	63	6	21	78	0	18	86	27	11	131
*** BREAK ***	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
4:00 PM	0	9	24	9	8	42	0	1	22	6	3	29	0	3	19	5	18	27	0	4	25	9	7	38
4:15 PM	0	15	20	8	27	43	0	2	20	6	3	28	0	3	22	5	17	30	0	8	32	4	12	44
4:30 PM	0	16	20	5	10	41	0	6	27	11	4	44	0	5	27	2	15	34	0	10	24	9	14	43
4:45 PM	0	13	26	6	15	45	1	3	23	9	1	36	0	4	21	3	16	28	0	10	17	12	5	39
Hourly Total	0	53	90	28	60	171	1	12	92	32	11	137	0	15	89	15	66	119	0	32	98	34	38	164
5:00 PM	0	20	22	8	13	50	0	7	22	7	6	36	0	10	24	0	9	34	0	10	36	11	9	57
5:15 PM	0	8	22	6	48	36	0	11	30	7	11	48	0	2	32	3	23	37	0	11	20	15	14	46
5:30 PM	1	22	19	11	11	53	0	12	30	8	4	50	0	3	30	6	5	39	0	9	39	10	5	58
5:45 PM	0	16	20	9	73	45	0	9	21	11	10	41	0	2	23	6	19	31	0	10	28	10	15	48
Hourly Total	1	66	83	34	145	184	0	39	103	33	31	175	0	17	109	15	56	141	0	40	123	46	43	209
Grand Total	1	201	324	99	379	625	1	83	289	87	58	480	0	51	330	40	160	421	0	103	388	121	115	612
Approach %	0.2	32.2	51.8	15.8	-	-	0.2	18.0	62.8	18.9	-	-	0.0	12.1	78.4	9.5	-	-	0.0	16.8	63.4	19.8	-	-
Total %	0.0	9.5	15.3	4.7	-	29.5	0.0	3.9	13.6	4.1	-	21.7	0.0	2.4	15.6	1.9	-	19.9	0.0	4.9	18.3	5.7	-	28.9
Lights	1	198	321	96	-	616	1	82	279	85	-	447	0	48	324	40	-	412	0	103	374	120	-	597
% Lights	100.0	98.5	99.1	97.0	-	98.6	100.0	98.8	96.5	97.7	-	97.2	-	94.1	98.2	100.0	-	97.9	-	100.0	96.4	99.2	-	97.5
Buses	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	3	0	-	3	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	5	0	-	5
% Buses	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	-	0.7	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	1.3	0.0	-	0.8
Single-Unit Trucks	0	1	1	2	-	4	0	0	5	1	-	6	0	3	2	0	-	5	0	0	4	0	-	4
% Single-Unit Trucks	0.0	0.5	0.3	2.0	-	0.6	0.0	0.0	1.7	1.1	-	1.3	-	5.9	0.6	0.0	-	1.2	-	0.0	1.0	0.0	-	0.7
Articulated Trucks	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	1	0	-	1	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	1	0	-	1
% Articulated Trucks	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.0	-	0.2	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.3	0.0	-	0.2
Bicycles on Road	0	2	2	1	-	5	0	1	1	1	-	3	0	0	4	0	-	4	0	0	4	1	-	5
% Bicycles on Road	0.0	1.0	0.6	1.0	-	0.8	0.0	1.2	0.3	1.1	-	0.7	-	0.0	1.2	0.0	-	1.0	-	0.0	1.0	0.8	-	0.8
Pedestrians	-	-	-	-	379	-	-	-	-	-	-	58	-	-	-	-	-	160	-	-	-	-	115	-



Kenig Lindgren O'Hara Aboona, Inc.
9575 W. Higgins Rd., Suite 400

Rosemont, Illinois, United States 60018
(847)518-9990

Count Name: Vail Avenue and Campbell Street
Site Code:
Start Date: 06/26/2018
Page No.: 3

Turning Movement Peak Hour Data (8:00 AM)

Start Time	Campbell Street Eastbound						Campbell Street Westbound						Vail Avenue Northbound						Vail Avenue Southbound					
	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total
8:00 AM	0	8	15	2	13	25	0	6	13	3	2	22	0	1	12	2	2	15	0	2	25	6	1	33
8:15 AM	0	12	24	4	19	40	0	5	12	3	3	20	0	5	12	3	6	20	0	4	25	5	4	34
8:30 AM	0	13	31	8	6	52	0	3	13	1	0	17	0	2	12	0	5	14	0	7	13	9	5	29
8:45 AM	0	18	27	11	2	56	0	4	12	4	2	20	0	1	27	1	8	29	0	5	23	7	1	35
Total	0	51	97	25	40	173	0	18	50	11	7	79	0	9	63	6	21	78	0	18	86	27	11	131
Approach %	0.0	29.5	56.1	14.5	-	-	0.0	22.8	63.3	13.9	-	-	0.0	11.5	80.8	7.7	-	-	0.0	13.7	65.6	20.6	-	-
Total %	0.0	11.1	21.0	5.4	-	37.5	0.0	3.9	10.8	2.4	-	17.1	0.0	2.0	13.7	1.3	-	16.9	0.0	3.9	18.7	5.9	-	28.4
PHF	0.000	0.708	0.782	0.568	-	0.772	0.000	0.750	0.962	0.688	-	0.898	0.000	0.450	0.583	0.500	-	0.672	0.000	0.643	0.860	0.750	-	0.936
Lights	0	51	97	25	-	173	0	18	47	11	-	76	0	8	61	6	-	75	0	18	79	26	-	123
% Lights	-	100.0	100.0	100.0	-	100.0	-	100.0	94.0	100.0	-	96.2	-	88.9	96.8	100.0	-	96.2	-	100.0	91.9	96.3	-	93.9
Buses	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	5
% Buses	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	4.0	0.0	-	2.5	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	5.8	0.0	-	3.8
Single-Unit Trucks	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	2	0	0	3	0	0	1	0	0	1
% Single-Unit Trucks	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	2.0	0.0	-	1.3	-	11.1	3.2	0.0	-	3.8	-	0.0	1.2	0.0	-	0.8
Articulated Trucks	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
% Articulated Trucks	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0
Bicycles on Road	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	-	2
% Bicycles on Road	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	1.2	3.7	-	1.5
Pedestrians	-	-	-	-	40	-	-	-	-	-	7	-	-	-	-	-	-	21	-	-	-	-	-	11
% Pedestrians	-	-	-	-	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	100.0



Kenig Lindgren O'Hara Aboona, Inc.
9575 W. Higgins Rd., Suite 400

Rosemont, Illinois, United States 60018
(847)518-9990

Count Name: Vail Avenue and Campbell Street
Site Code:
Start Date: 06/26/2018
Page No: 4

Turning Movement Peak Hour Data (5:00 PM)

Start Time	Campbell Street Eastbound						Campbell Street Westbound						Vail Avenue Northbound						Vail Avenue Southbound					
	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total
5:00 PM	0	20	22	8	13	50	0	7	22	7	6	36	0	10	24	0	9	34	0	10	36	11	9	57
5:15 PM	0	8	22	6	48	36	0	11	30	7	11	48	0	2	32	3	23	37	0	11	20	15	14	46
5:30 PM	1	22	19	11	11	53	0	12	30	8	4	50	0	3	30	6	5	39	0	9	39	10	5	58
5:45 PM	0	16	20	9	73	45	0	9	21	11	10	41	0	2	23	6	19	31	0	10	28	10	15	48
Total	1	66	83	34	145	184	0	39	103	33	31	175	0	17	109	15	56	141	0	40	123	46	43	209
Approach %	0.5	35.9	45.1	18.5	-	-	0.0	22.3	58.9	18.9	-	-	0.0	12.1	77.3	10.6	-	-	0.0	19.1	58.9	22.0	-	-
Total %	0.1	9.3	11.7	4.8	-	26.0	0.0	5.5	14.5	4.7	-	24.7	0.0	2.4	15.4	2.1	-	19.9	0.0	5.6	17.3	6.5	-	29.5
PHF	0.250	0.750	0.943	0.773	-	0.868	0.000	0.813	0.858	0.750	-	0.875	0.000	0.425	0.852	0.625	-	0.904	0.000	0.909	0.788	0.767	-	0.901
Lights	1	65	83	34	-	183	0	39	103	33	-	175	0	17	107	15	-	139	0	40	121	46	-	207
% Lights	100.0	98.5	100.0	100.0	-	99.5	-	100.0	100.0	100.0	-	100.0	-	100.0	98.2	100.0	-	98.6	-	100.0	98.4	100.0	-	99.0
Buses	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0
% Buses	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0
Single-Unit Trucks	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	1	0	-	1
% Single-Unit Trucks	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.8	0.0	-	0.5
Articulated Trucks	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0
% Articulated Trucks	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0
Bicycles on Road	0	1	0	0	-	1	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	2	0	-	2	0	0	1	0	-	1
% Bicycles on Road	0.0	1.5	0.0	0.0	-	0.5	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	1.8	0.0	-	1.4	-	0.0	0.8	0.0	-	0.5
Pedestrians	-	-	-	-	145	-	-	-	-	-	31	-	-	-	-	-	-	56	-	-	-	-	43	-
% Pedestrians	-	-	-	-	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	100.0	-	-	-	-	100.0	-



Kenig, Lindgren, O'Hara, Aboona, Inc.
9575 W. Higgins Rd., Suite 400

Rosemont, Illinois, United States 60018
(847)518-9990

Count Name: Campbell Street and Dunton
Avenue
Site Code:
Start Date: 06/26/2018
Page No: 1

Turning Movement Data

Start Time	Campbell Street Eastbound						Campbell Street Westbound						Dunton Avenue Northbound						Dunton Avenue Southbound						App. Total	Int. Total
	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total		
7:00 AM	0	4	11	2	7	17	0	2	9	7	5	18	0	3	19	2	2	24	0	1	18	1	5	20	79	
7:15 AM	0	3	16	0	2	19	0	0	7	3	14	10	0	2	11	1	8	14	0	2	9	3	6	14	57	
7:30 AM	0	6	8	3	4	17	0	1	12	2	2	15	0	1	24	2	2	27	0	4	19	8	1	31	90	
7:45 AM	0	5	14	1	3	20	0	1	11	8	7	20	0	4	18	4	0	26	0	4	18	9	2	31	97	
Hourly Total	0	18	49	6	16	73	0	4	39	20	28	63	0	10	72	9	12	91	0	11	64	21	14	96	323	
8:00 AM	0	5	10	2	5	17	0	2	10	2	2	14	0	4	11	1	4	16	0	1	16	7	1	24	71	
8:15 AM	0	3	24	4	2	31	0	2	10	2	3	14	0	3	10	1	3	14	0	5	21	4	5	30	89	
8:30 AM	0	6	23	8	1	37	1	0	10	5	2	16	0	2	15	1	5	18	0	3	12	9	6	24	95	
8:45 AM	0	7	21	4	0	32	0	1	8	4	2	13	0	1	20	7	3	28	0	4	24	11	6	39	112	
Hourly Total	0	21	78	18	8	117	1	5	38	13	9	57	0	10	56	10	15	76	0	13	73	31	18	117	367	
*** BREAK ***	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
4:00 PM	0	5	19	7	6	31	0	1	13	13	8	27	0	8	21	4	9	33	0	3	17	5	12	25	116	
4:15 PM	0	7	21	4	7	32	0	10	14	10	3	34	0	5	32	6	8	43	0	4	25	9	9	38	147	
4:30 PM	0	4	19	11	5	34	0	2	25	10	18	37	0	14	20	8	21	42	0	0	20	8	15	28	141	
4:45 PM	0	9	22	8	3	39	0	1	12	8	5	21	0	13	32	4	10	49	0	10	15	10	4	35	144	
Hourly Total	0	25	81	30	21	136	0	14	64	41	34	119	0	40	105	22	48	167	0	17	77	32	40	126	548	
5:00 PM	0	7	23	3	4	33	1	4	22	10	0	37	0	10	29	7	11	46	0	3	30	10	1	43	159	
5:15 PM	0	9	19	8	14	36	0	4	24	11	4	39	0	10	36	7	11	53	0	6	14	9	3	29	157	
5:30 PM	0	6	17	10	4	33	0	6	28	4	5	38	1	8	28	4	5	41	0	8	23	17	7	48	160	
5:45 PM	0	10	21	9	13	40	0	5	19	11	3	35	0	14	34	7	18	55	0	11	40	9	5	60	190	
Hourly Total	0	32	80	30	35	142	1	19	93	36	12	149	1	42	127	25	45	195	0	28	107	45	16	180	666	
Grand Total	0	96	288	84	80	468	2	42	234	110	83	388	1	102	360	66	120	529	0	69	321	129	88	519	1904	
Approach %	0.0	20.5	61.5	17.9	-	-	0.5	10.8	60.3	28.4	-	-	0.2	19.3	68.1	12.5	-	-	0.0	13.3	61.8	24.9	-	-	90	
Total %	0.0	5.0	15.1	4.4	-	24.6	0.1	2.2	12.3	5.8	-	20.4	0.1	5.4	18.9	3.5	-	27.8	0.0	3.6	16.9	6.8	-	27.3	-	
Lights	0	95	286	84	-	465	2	40	230	110	-	382	1	99	352	65	-	517	0	68	309	125	-	502	1866	
% Lights	-	99.0	99.3	100.0	-	99.4	100.0	95.2	98.3	100.0	-	98.5	100.0	97.1	97.8	98.5	-	97.7	-	98.6	96.3	96.9	-	96.7	98.0	
Buses	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	1	1	0	-	2	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	2	1	-	3	5	
% Buses	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	2.4	0.4	0.0	-	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.6	0.8	-	0.6	0.3	
Single-Unit Trucks	0	0	1	0	-	1	0	0	2	0	-	2	0	3	3	1	-	7	0	0	1	1	-	2	12	
% Single-Unit Trucks	-	0.0	0.3	0.0	-	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.9	0.0	-	0.5	0.0	2.9	0.8	1.5	-	1.3	-	0.0	0.3	0.8	-	0.4	0.6	
Articulated Trucks	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	1	0	-	1	0	0	0	1	-	1	2	
% Articulated Trucks	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.0	-	0.2	-	0.0	0.0	0.8	-	0.2	0.1	
Bicycles on Road	0	1	1	0	-	2	0	1	1	0	-	2	0	0	4	0	-	4	0	1	9	1	-	11	19	
% Bicycles on Road	-	1.0	0.3	0.0	-	0.4	0.0	2.4	0.4	0.0	-	0.5	0.0	0.0	1.1	0.0	-	0.8	-	1.4	2.8	0.8	-	2.1	1.0	
Pedestrians	-	-	-	-	80	-	-	-	-	-	83	-	-	-	-	-	120	-	-	-	-	-	88	-	-	



Kenig Lindgren O'Hara Aboona, Inc.
9575 W. Higgins Rd., Suite 400

Rosemont, Illinois, United States 60018
(847)518-9990

Count Name: Campbell Street and Dunton Avenue
Site Code:
Start Date: 06/26/2018
Page No.: 3

Turning Movement Peak Hour Data (8:00 AM)

Start Time	Campbell Street Eastbound						Campbell Street Westbound						Dunton Avenue Northbound						Dunton Avenue Southbound					
	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total
8:00 AM	0	5	10	2	5	17	0	2	10	2	2	14	0	4	11	1	4	16	0	1	16	7	1	24
8:15 AM	0	3	24	4	2	31	0	2	10	2	3	14	0	3	10	1	3	14	0	5	21	4	5	30
8:30 AM	0	6	23	8	1	37	1	0	10	5	2	16	0	2	15	1	5	18	0	3	12	9	6	24
8:45 AM	0	7	21	4	0	32	0	1	8	4	2	13	0	1	20	7	3	28	0	4	24	11	6	39
Total	0	21	78	18	8	117	1	5	38	13	9	57	0	10	56	10	15	76	0	13	73	31	18	117
Approach %	0.0	17.9	66.7	15.4	-	-	1.8	8.8	66.7	22.8	-	-	0.0	13.2	73.7	13.2	-	-	0.0	11.1	62.4	26.5	-	-
Total %	0.0	5.7	21.3	4.9	-	31.9	0.3	1.4	10.4	3.5	-	15.5	0.0	2.7	15.3	2.7	-	20.7	0.0	3.5	19.9	8.4	-	31.9
PHF	0.000	0.750	0.813	0.563	-	0.791	0.250	0.625	0.950	0.650	-	0.891	0.000	0.625	0.700	0.357	-	0.679	0.000	0.650	0.760	0.705	-	0.750
Lights	0	21	77	18	-	116	1	5	37	13	-	56	0	9	55	9	-	73	0	13	70	30	-	113
% Lights	-	100.0	98.7	100.0	-	99.1	100.0	100.0	97.4	100.0	-	98.2	-	90.0	98.2	90.0	-	96.1	-	100.0	95.9	96.8	-	96.6
Buses	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	1	0	-	1	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	2	1	-	3
% Buses	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.6	0.0	-	1.8	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	2.7	3.2	-	2.6
Single-Unit Trucks	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	1	1	1	-	3	0	0	0	0	-	0
% Single-Unit Trucks	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	10.0	1.8	10.0	-	3.9	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0
Articulated Trucks	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0
% Articulated Trucks	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0
Bicycles on Road	0	0	1	0	-	1	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	1	0	-	1
% Bicycles on Road	-	0.0	1.3	0.0	-	0.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	1.4	0.0	-	0.9
Pedestrians	-	-	-	-	8	-	-	-	-	-	9	-	-	-	-	-	-	15	-	-	-	-	18	-
% Pedestrians	-	-	-	-	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	100.0	-	-	-	-	100.0	-



Kenig Lindgren O'Hara Aboona, Inc.
9575 W. Higgins Rd., Suite 400

Rosemont, Illinois, United States 60018
(847)518-9990

Count Name: Campbell Street and Dunton Avenue
Site Code:
Start Date: 06/26/2018
Page No: 4

Turning Movement Peak Hour Data (5:00 PM)

Start Time	Campbell Street Eastbound						Campbell Street Westbound						Dunton Avenue Northbound						Dunton Avenue Southbound						App. Total	Peds	App. Total	Int. Total
	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total				
5:00 PM	0	7	23	3	4	33	1	4	22	10	0	37	0	10	29	7	11	46	0	3	30	10	1	43	159			
5:15 PM	0	9	19	8	14	36	0	4	24	11	4	39	0	10	36	7	11	53	0	6	14	9	3	29	157			
5:30 PM	0	6	17	10	4	33	0	6	28	4	5	38	1	8	28	4	5	41	0	8	23	17	7	48	160			
5:45 PM	0	10	21	9	13	40	0	5	19	11	3	35	0	14	34	7	18	55	0	11	40	9	5	60	190			
Total	0	32	80	30	35	142	1	19	93	36	12	149	1	42	127	25	45	195	0	28	107	45	16	180	666			
Approach %	0.0	22.5	56.3	21.1	-	-	0.7	12.8	62.4	24.2	-	-	0.5	21.5	65.1	12.8	-	-	-	0.0	15.6	59.4	25.0	-	-	-		
Total %	0.0	4.8	12.0	4.5	-	21.3	0.2	2.9	14.0	5.4	-	22.4	0.2	6.3	19.1	3.8	-	29.3	0.0	4.2	16.1	6.8	-	27.0	-			
PHF	0.000	0.800	0.870	0.750	-	0.888	0.250	0.792	0.830	0.818	-	0.955	0.250	0.750	0.882	0.893	-	0.886	0.000	0.636	0.669	0.662	-	0.750	0.876			
Lights	0	32	80	30	-	142	1	19	93	36	-	149	1	42	127	25	-	195	0	27	101	45	-	173	659			
% Lights	-	100.0	100.0	100.0	-	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	-	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	-	100.0	-	96.4	94.4	100.0	-	96.1	98.9			
Buses	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0			
% Buses	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0			
Single-Unit Trucks	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0			
% Single-Unit Trucks	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0			
Articulated Trucks	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0			
% Articulated Trucks	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0			
Bicycles on Road	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	1	6	0	-	7	7			
% Bicycles on Road	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	3.6	5.6	0.0	-	3.9	1.1			
Pedestrians	-	-	-	-	35	-	-	-	-	-	12	-	-	-	-	-	45	-	-	-	-	-	16	-	-			
% Pedestrians	-	-	-	-	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	100.0	-	-			



Kenig Lindgren O'Hara Aboona, Inc.
9575 W. Higgins Rd., Suite 400
Rosemont, Illinois, United States 60018
(847)518-9990

Count Name: Campbell Street and Ridge
Avenue
Site Code:
Start Date: 06/26/2018
Page No: 1

Turning Movement Data

Start Time	Campbell Street Eastbound						Campbell Street Westbound						Ridge Avenue Northbound						Ridge Avenue Southbound					
	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	Int. Total					
7:00 AM	0	11	22	5	0	38	0	1	26	2	0	29	0	7	26	0	2	33	38	138				
7:15 AM	0	8	18	3	0	29	0	2	16	3	0	21	0	4	30	0	0	34	43	127				
7:30 AM	0	18	21	1	0	40	0	2	21	2	0	25	0	3	32	1	1	36	66	167				
7:45 AM	0	12	26	3	0	41	0	1	15	10	0	26	0	8	27	0	0	35	74	176				
Hourly Total	0	49	87	12	0	148	0	6	78	17	0	101	0	22	115	1	3	138	221	608				
8:00 AM	0	12	29	3	0	44	0	2	19	7	0	28	0	6	20	1	0	27	56	155				
8:15 AM	0	10	41	5	0	56	0	4	20	4	0	28	0	3	36	3	1	42	52	178				
8:30 AM	0	16	27	8	0	51	0	2	21	2	0	25	0	7	26	1	0	34	49	159				
8:45 AM	0	8	36	7	0	51	0	1	17	1	0	19	0	9	38	4	0	51	74	195				
Hourly Total	0	46	133	23	0	202	0	9	77	14	0	100	0	25	120	9	1	154	231	687				
*** BREAK ***	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-				
4:00 PM	0	19	39	8	0	66	0	4	27	7	0	38	0	7	29	4	0	40	55	199				
4:15 PM	0	17	53	12	1	82	0	3	29	6	0	38	0	4	32	3	0	39	50	209				
4:30 PM	0	16	43	7	0	66	0	0	33	2	0	35	0	9	37	5	1	51	59	211				
4:45 PM	0	16	38	8	1	62	0	4	21	3	0	28	0	6	45	4	0	55	57	202				
Hourly Total	0	68	173	35	2	276	0	11	110	18	0	139	0	26	143	16	1	185	221	821				
5:00 PM	0	24	36	9	0	69	0	3	34	10	0	47	0	10	47	3	1	60	49	225				
5:15 PM	0	22	26	11	1	59	0	5	40	1	0	46	0	4	38	2	0	44	55	204				
5:30 PM	0	21	40	5	0	66	0	1	29	5	0	35	0	10	46	2	0	58	48	207				
5:45 PM	0	9	34	9	0	52	0	2	16	6	0	24	0	7	49	4	0	60	50	186				
Hourly Total	0	76	136	34	1	246	0	11	119	22	0	152	0	31	180	11	1	222	202	822				
Grand Total	0	239	529	104	3	872	0	37	384	71	0	492	0	104	558	37	6	699	875	2938				
Approach %	0.0	27.4	60.7	11.9	-	-	0.0	7.5	78.0	14.4	-	-	0.0	14.9	79.8	5.3	-	-	-	-				
Total %	0.0	8.1	18.0	3.5	-	29.7	0.0	1.3	13.1	2.4	-	16.7	0.0	3.5	19.0	1.3	-	23.8	29.8	-				
Lights	0	239	525	99	-	863	0	37	371	69	-	477	0	102	538	36	-	676	858	2874				
% Lights	-	100.0	99.2	95.2	-	99.0	-	100.0	96.6	97.2	-	97.0	-	98.1	96.4	97.3	-	96.7	98.1	97.8				
Buses	0	0	0	1	-	1	0	0	2	0	-	2	0	0	1	0	-	1	5	2				
% Buses	-	0.0	0.0	1.0	-	0.1	-	0.0	0.5	0.0	-	0.4	-	0.0	0.2	0.0	-	0.1	0.1	0.2				
Single-Unit Trucks	0	0	1	3	-	4	0	0	7	0	-	7	0	2	12	0	-	14	11	36				
% Single-Unit Trucks	-	0.0	0.2	2.9	-	0.5	-	0.0	1.8	0.0	-	1.4	-	1.9	2.2	0.0	-	2.0	1.3	1.2				
Articulated Trucks	0	0	1	1	-	2	0	0	0	1	-	1	0	0	2	0	-	2	1	6				
% Articulated Trucks	-	0.0	0.2	1.0	-	0.2	-	0.0	0.0	1.4	-	0.2	-	0.0	0.4	0.0	-	0.3	0.1	0.2				
Bicycles on Road	0	0	2	0	-	2	0	0	4	1	-	5	0	0	5	1	-	6	4	17				
% Bicycles on Road	-	0.0	0.4	0.0	-	0.2	-	0.0	1.0	1.4	-	1.0	-	0.0	0.9	2.7	-	0.9	0.5	0.6				
Pedestrians	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	-	-	-	-	-	4	-	-				



Kenig Lindgren O'Hara Aboona, Inc.
9575 W. Higgins Rd., Suite 400

Rosemont, Illinois, United States 60018
(847)518-9990

Count Name: Campbell Street and Ridge
Avenue
Site Code:
Start Date: 06/26/2018
Page No.: 3

Turning Movement Peak Hour Data (8:00 AM)

Start Time	Campbell Street Eastbound						Campbell Street Westbound						Ridge Avenue Northbound						Ridge Avenue Southbound					
	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total
8:00 AM	0	12	29	3	0	44	0	2	19	7	0	28	0	6	20	1	0	27	0	7	36	13	0	56
8:15 AM	0	10	41	5	0	56	0	4	20	4	0	28	0	3	36	3	1	42	0	7	33	12	0	52
8:30 AM	0	16	27	8	0	51	0	2	21	2	0	25	0	7	26	1	0	34	0	4	43	2	1	49
8:45 AM	0	8	36	7	0	51	0	1	17	1	0	19	0	9	38	4	0	51	0	10	51	13	0	74
Total	0	46	133	23	0	202	0	9	77	14	0	100	0	25	120	9	1	154	0	28	163	40	1	231
Approach %	0.0	22.8	65.8	11.4	-	-	0.0	9.0	77.0	14.0	-	-	0.0	16.2	77.9	5.8	-	-	0.0	12.1	70.6	17.3	-	-
Total %	0.0	6.7	19.4	3.3	-	29.4	0.0	1.3	11.2	2.0	-	14.6	0.0	3.6	17.5	1.3	-	22.4	0.0	4.1	23.7	5.8	-	33.6
PHF	0.000	0.719	0.811	0.719	-	0.902	0.000	0.563	0.917	0.500	-	0.893	0.000	0.694	0.789	0.563	-	0.755	0.000	0.700	0.799	0.769	-	0.780
Lights	0	46	132	22	-	200	0	9	74	14	-	97	0	25	119	9	-	153	0	28	161	39	-	228
% Lights	-	100.0	99.2	95.7	-	99.0	-	100.0	96.1	100.0	-	97.0	-	100.0	99.2	100.0	-	99.4	-	100.0	98.8	97.5	-	98.7
Buses	0	0	0	1	-	1	0	0	1	0	-	1	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	1	-	1
% Buses	-	0.0	0.0	4.3	-	0.5	-	0.0	1.3	0.0	-	1.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	2.5	-	0.4
Single-Unit Trucks	0	0	1	0	-	1	0	0	2	0	-	2	0	0	1	0	-	1	0	0	1	0	-	1
% Single-Unit Trucks	-	0.0	0.8	0.0	-	0.5	-	0.0	2.6	0.0	-	2.0	-	0.0	0.8	0.0	-	0.6	-	0.0	0.6	0.0	-	0.4
Articulated Trucks	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0
% Articulated Trucks	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0
Bicycles on Road	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	1	0	-	1
% Bicycles on Road	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.6	0.0	-	0.4
Pedestrians	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-
% Pedestrians	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	100.0	-



Kenig Lindgren O'Hara Aboona, Inc.
9575 W. Higgins Rd., Suite 400

Rosemont, Illinois, United States 60018
(847)518-9990

Count Name: Campbell Street and Ridge Avenue
Site Code:
Start Date: 06/26/2018
Page No: 4

Turning Movement Peak Hour Data (5:00 PM)

Start Time	Campbell Street Eastbound						Campbell Street Westbound						Ridge Avenue Northbound						Ridge Avenue Southbound					
	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total
5:00 PM	0	24	36	9	0	69	0	3	34	10	0	47	0	10	47	3	1	60	0	5	32	12	0	49
5:15 PM	0	22	26	11	1	59	0	5	40	1	0	46	0	4	38	2	0	44	0	2	37	16	1	55
5:30 PM	0	21	40	5	0	66	0	1	29	5	0	35	0	10	46	2	0	58	0	3	24	21	0	48
5:45 PM	0	9	34	9	0	52	0	2	16	6	0	24	0	7	49	4	0	60	0	7	31	12	0	50
Total	0	76	136	34	1	246	0	11	119	22	0	152	0	31	180	11	1	222	0	17	124	61	1	202
Approach %	0.0	30.9	55.3	13.8	-	-	0.0	7.2	78.3	14.5	-	-	0.0	14.0	81.1	5.0	-	-	0.0	8.4	61.4	30.2	-	-
Total %	0.0	9.2	16.5	4.1	-	29.9	0.0	1.3	14.5	2.7	-	18.5	0.0	3.8	21.9	1.3	-	27.0	0.0	2.1	15.1	7.4	-	24.6
PHF	0.000	0.792	0.850	0.773	-	0.891	0.000	0.550	0.744	0.550	-	0.809	0.000	0.775	0.918	0.688	-	0.925	0.000	0.607	0.838	0.726	-	0.918
Lights	0	76	135	34	-	245	0	11	118	22	-	151	0	29	174	11	-	214	0	17	121	61	-	199
% Lights	-	100.0	99.3	100.0	-	99.6	-	100.0	99.2	100.0	-	99.3	-	93.5	96.7	100.0	-	96.4	-	100.0	97.6	100.0	-	98.5
Buses	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	1	0	-	1	0	0	0	0	-	0
% Buses	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.6	0.0	-	0.5	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0
Single-Unit Trucks	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	1	0	-	1	0	2	5	0	-	7	0	0	2	0	-	2
% Single-Unit Trucks	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.8	0.0	-	0.7	-	6.5	2.8	0.0	-	3.2	-	0.0	1.6	0.0	-	1.0
Articulated Trucks	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	1	0	-	1
% Articulated Trucks	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.8	0.0	-	0.5
Bicycles on Road	0	0	1	0	-	1	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0
% Bicycles on Road	-	0.0	0.7	0.0	-	0.4	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0
Pedestrians	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-
% Pedestrians	-	-	-	-	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100.0	-	-	-	-	100.0	-



Kenig, Lindgren, O'Hara, Aboona, Inc.
9575 W. Higgins Rd., Suite 400
Rosemont, Illinois, United States 60018
(847)518-9990

Count Name: Campbell Street and Mitchell
Avenue
Site Code:
Start Date: 06/26/2018
Page No: 1

Turning Movement Data

Start Time	Campbell Street Eastbound					Campbell Street Westbound					Mitchell Avenue Northbound				
	U-Turn	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Right	Peds	Int. Total
7:00 AM	0	25	0	0	25	0	1	24	1	25	0	2	3	0	55
7:15 AM	0	27	2	0	29	0	0	24	0	24	0	0	0	0	53
7:30 AM	0	28	0	0	28	0	1	24	3	25	0	0	2	1	55
7:45 AM	0	41	0	0	41	0	1	24	2	25	0	1	2	1	69
Hourly Total	0	121	2	0	123	0	3	96	6	99	0	3	7	2	232
8:00 AM	0	31	0	0	31	0	0	25	0	25	0	3	1	0	60
8:15 AM	0	51	0	0	51	0	1	25	0	26	0	2	4	0	83
8:30 AM	0	39	0	0	39	0	1	24	0	25	0	0	0	0	64
8:45 AM	1	44	2	0	47	0	1	16	0	17	0	3	4	3	71
Hourly Total	1	165	2	0	168	0	3	90	0	93	0	8	9	3	278
*** BREAK ***	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
4:00 PM	0	48	1	0	49	0	2	40	0	42	0	2	2	0	95
4:15 PM	0	57	0	0	57	0	0	32	0	32	0	3	3	1	95
4:30 PM	0	52	2	0	54	0	4	37	0	41	0	0	3	1	98
4:45 PM	0	51	0	0	51	0	2	24	0	26	0	3	1	1	81
Hourly Total	0	208	3	0	211	0	8	133	0	141	0	8	9	3	369
5:00 PM	0	42	2	0	44	0	1	43	0	44	0	1	2	4	91
5:15 PM	0	38	1	0	39	0	3	43	0	46	0	1	1	0	87
5:30 PM	0	40	2	0	42	0	3	35	0	38	0	0	2	0	82
5:45 PM	0	52	0	0	52	0	1	22	1	23	0	1	3	3	79
Hourly Total	0	172	5	0	177	0	8	143	1	151	0	3	8	7	339
Grand Total	1	666	12	0	679	0	22	462	7	484	0	22	33	15	1218
Approach %	0.1	98.1	1.8	-	-	0.0	4.5	95.5	-	-	0.0	40.0	60.0	-	-
Total %	0.1	54.7	1.0	-	55.7	0.0	1.8	37.9	-	39.7	0.0	1.8	2.7	-	4.5
Lights	1	661	12	-	674	0	20	452	-	472	0	22	28	-	1196
% Lights	100.0	99.2	100.0	-	99.3	-	90.9	97.8	-	97.5	-	100.0	84.8	-	98.2
Buses	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	2	-	2	0	0	0	-	2
% Buses	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.4	-	0.4	-	0.0	0.0	-	0.2
Single-Unit Trucks	0	1	0	-	1	0	0	3	-	3	0	0	0	-	4
% Single-Unit Trucks	0.0	0.2	0.0	-	0.1	-	0.0	0.6	-	0.6	-	0.0	0.0	-	0.3
Articulated Trucks	0	1	0	-	1	0	0	1	-	1	0	0	0	-	2
% Articulated Trucks	0.0	0.2	0.0	-	0.1	-	0.0	0.2	-	0.2	-	0.0	0.0	-	0.2
Bicycles on Road	0	3	0	-	3	0	2	4	-	6	0	0	5	-	14
% Bicycles on Road	0.0	0.5	0.0	-	0.4	-	9.1	0.9	-	1.2	-	0.0	15.2	-	1.1
Pedestrians	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	7	-	-	-	-	15	-
% Pedestrians	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100.0	-	-	-	-	100.0	-



Kenig Lindgren O'Hara Aboona, Inc.
9575 W. Higgins Rd., Suite 400

Rosemont, Illinois, United States 60018
(847)518-9990

Count Name: Campbell Street and Mitchell Avenue
Site Code:
Start Date: 06/26/2018
Page No.: 2

Turning Movement Peak Hour Data (8:00 AM)

Start Time	Campbell Street Eastbound					Campbell Street Westbound					Mitchell Avenue Northbound				
	U-Turn	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Right	Peds	Int. Total
8:00 AM	0	31	0	0	31	0	0	25	0	25	0	3	1	0	60
8:15 AM	0	51	0	0	51	0	1	25	0	26	0	2	4	0	83
8:30 AM	0	39	0	0	39	0	1	24	0	25	0	0	0	0	64
8:45 AM	1	44	2	0	47	0	1	16	0	17	0	3	4	3	71
Total	1	165	2	0	168	0	3	90	0	93	0	8	9	3	278
Approach %	0.6	98.2	1.2	-	-	0.0	3.2	96.8	-	-	0.0	47.1	52.9	-	-
Total %	0.4	59.4	0.7	-	60.4	0.0	1.1	32.4	-	33.5	0.0	2.9	3.2	-	-
PHF	0.250	0.809	0.250	-	0.824	0.000	0.750	0.900	-	0.894	0.000	0.667	0.563	-	0.837
Lights	1	164	2	-	167	0	3	88	-	91	0	8	9	-	275
% Lights	100.0	99.4	100.0	-	99.4	-	100.0	97.8	-	97.8	-	100.0	100.0	-	98.9
Buses	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	1	-	1	0	0	0	-	1
% Buses	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	1.1	-	1.1	-	0.0	0.0	-	0.4
Single-Unit Trucks	0	1	0	-	1	0	0	1	-	1	0	0	0	-	2
% Single-Unit Trucks	0.0	0.6	0.0	-	0.6	-	0.0	1.1	-	1.1	-	0.0	0.0	-	0.7
Articulated Trucks	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	-	0
% Articulated Trucks	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	-	0.0
Bicycles on Road	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	-	0
% Bicycles on Road	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	-	0.0
Pedestrians	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	3	-
% Pedestrians	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100.0	-



Kenig, Lindgren, O'Hara, Aboona, Inc.
9575 W. Higgins Rd., Suite 400

Rosemont, Illinois, United States 60018
(847)518-9990

Count Name: Campbell Street and Mitchell Avenue
Site Code:
Start Date: 06/26/2018
Page No.: 3

Turning Movement Peak Hour Data (5:00 PM)

Start Time	Campbell Street Eastbound					Campbell Street Westbound					Mitchell Avenue Northbound				
	U-Turn	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Right	Peds	Int. Total
5:00 PM	0	42	2	0	44	0	1	43	0	44	0	1	2	4	91
5:15 PM	0	38	1	0	39	0	3	43	0	46	0	1	1	0	87
5:30 PM	0	40	2	0	42	0	3	35	0	38	0	0	2	0	82
5:45 PM	0	52	0	0	52	0	1	22	1	23	0	1	3	3	79
Total	0	172	5	0	177	0	8	143	1	151	0	3	8	7	339
Approach %	0.0	97.2	2.8	-	-	0.0	5.3	94.7	-	-	0.0	27.3	72.7	-	-
Total %	0.0	50.7	1.5	-	52.2	0.0	2.4	42.2	-	44.5	0.0	0.9	2.4	-	3.2
PHF	0.000	0.927	0.625	-	0.851	0.000	0.667	0.831	-	0.821	0.000	0.750	0.667	-	0.888
Lights	0	171	5	-	176	0	7	143	-	150	0	3	8	-	11
% Lights	-	99.4	100.0	-	99.4	-	87.5	100.0	-	99.3	-	100.0	100.0	-	100.0
Buses	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	-	0
% Buses	-	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	-	0.0
Single-Unit Trucks	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	-	0
% Single-Unit Trucks	-	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	-	0.0
Articulated Trucks	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	-	0
% Articulated Trucks	-	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	-	0.0
Bicycles on Road	0	1	0	-	1	0	1	0	-	1	0	0	0	-	2
% Bicycles on Road	-	0.6	0.0	-	0.6	-	12.5	0.0	-	0.7	-	0.0	0.0	-	0.6
Pedestrians	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	7	-
% Pedestrians	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100.0	-	-	-	-	100.0	-



Kenig Lindgren O'Hara Aboona, Inc.
9575 W. Higgins Rd., Suite 400

Rosemont, Illinois, United States 60018
(847)518-9990

Count Name: Wing Street and Chestnut Avenue
Site Code:
Start Date: 06/26/2018
Page No: 1

Turning Movement Data

Start Time	Wing Street Eastbound				Wing Street Westbound				Chestnut Avenue Northbound			
	U-Turn	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left
7:00 AM	0	15	1	0	16	0	6	11	0	17	0	0
7:15 AM	0	6	0	0	6	0	1	6	0	7	0	1
7:30 AM	0	12	0	0	12	0	6	10	0	16	0	1
7:45 AM	0	17	0	0	17	0	4	15	0	19	0	0
Hourly Total	0	50	1	0	51	0	17	42	0	59	0	2
8:00 AM	0	4	1	0	5	0	6	14	0	20	0	0
8:15 AM	0	6	1	0	7	1	3	7	0	11	0	3
8:30 AM	0	8	2	0	10	0	5	4	0	9	0	0
8:45 AM	0	8	1	1	9	0	3	8	0	11	0	0
Hourly Total	0	26	5	1	31	1	17	33	0	51	0	3
*** BREAK ***	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
4:00 PM	0	10	3	0	13	0	10	13	1	23	0	2
4:15 PM	0	7	1	0	8	2	7	16	0	25	0	0
4:30 PM	0	10	1	0	11	0	8	20	0	28	0	2
4:45 PM	0	12	2	0	14	0	6	24	0	30	0	1
Hourly Total	0	39	7	0	46	2	31	73	1	106	0	5
5:00 PM	0	12	1	0	13	0	3	17	0	20	0	0
5:15 PM	0	22	0	0	22	0	12	21	2	33	0	2
5:30 PM	0	13	0	0	13	0	13	24	0	37	0	2
5:45 PM	0	20	2	0	22	2	16	17	1	35	0	0
Hourly Total	0	67	3	0	70	2	44	79	3	125	0	4
Grand Total	0	182	16	1	198	5	109	227	4	341	0	14
Approach %	0.0	91.9	8.1	-	-	1.5	32.0	66.6	-	-	0.0	11.5
Total %	0.0	27.5	2.4	-	30.0	0.8	16.5	34.3	-	51.6	0.0	2.1
Lights	0	176	14	-	190	5	105	223	-	333	0	12
% Lights	-	96.7	87.5	-	96.0	100.0	96.3	98.2	-	97.7	-	85.7
Buses	0	1	0	-	1	0	0	0	-	0	0	0
% Buses	-	0.5	0.0	-	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0
Single-Unit Trucks	0	0	2	-	2	0	0	3	-	3	0	1
% Single-Unit Trucks	-	0.0	12.5	-	1.0	0.0	0.0	1.3	-	0.9	-	7.1
Articulated Trucks	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	1
% Articulated Trucks	-	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	7.1
Bicycles on Road	0	5	0	-	5	0	4	1	-	5	0	0
% Bicycles on Road	-	2.7	0.0	-	2.5	0.0	3.7	0.4	-	1.5	-	0.0
Pedestrians	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	4	-	-	-
% Pedestrians	-	-	-	100.0	-	-	-	-	100.0	-	-	-



Kenig, Lindgren, O'Hara, Aboona, Inc.
9575 W. Higgins Rd., Suite 400

Rosemont, Illinois, United States 60018
(847)518-9990

Count Name: Wing Street and Chestnut Avenue
Site Code:
Start Date: 06/26/2018
Page No.: 2

Turning Movement Peak Hour Data (8:00 AM)

Start Time	Wing Street Eastbound					Wing Street Westbound					Chestnut Avenue Northbound				
	U-Turn	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Right	Peds	Int. Total
8:00 AM	0	4	1	0	5	0	6	14	0	20	0	0	1	0	26
8:15 AM	0	6	1	0	7	1	3	7	0	11	0	3	4	0	25
8:30 AM	0	8	2	0	10	0	5	4	0	9	0	0	1	0	20
8:45 AM	0	8	1	1	9	0	3	8	0	11	0	0	7	0	27
Total	0	26	5	1	31	1	17	33	0	51	0	3	13	0	98
Approach %	0.0	83.9	16.1	-	-	2.0	33.3	64.7	-	-	0.0	18.8	81.3	-	-
Total %	0.0	26.5	5.1	-	31.6	1.0	17.3	33.7	-	52.0	0.0	3.1	13.3	-	16.3
PHF	0.000	0.813	0.625	-	0.775	0.250	0.708	0.589	-	0.638	0.000	0.250	0.464	-	0.907
Lights	0	26	5	-	31	1	17	32	-	50	0	3	12	-	96
% Lights	-	100.0	100.0	-	100.0	100.0	100.0	97.0	-	98.0	-	100.0	92.3	-	98.0
Buses	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	-	0
% Buses	-	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	-	0.0
Single-Unit Trucks	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	1	-	1	0	0	1	-	2
% Single-Unit Trucks	-	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	-	2.0	-	0.0	7.7	-	2.0
Articulated Trucks	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	-	0
% Articulated Trucks	-	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	-	0.0
Bicycles on Road	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	-	0
% Bicycles on Road	-	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	-	0.0
Pedestrians	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	0	-
% Pedestrians	-	-	-	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-



Kenig Lindgren O'Hara Aboona, Inc.
9575 W. Higgins Rd., Suite 400

Rosemont, Illinois, United States 60018
(847)518-9990

Count Name: Wing Street and Chestnut Avenue
Site Code:
Start Date: 06/26/2018
Page No.: 3

Turning Movement Peak Hour Data (5:00 PM)

Start Time	Wing Street Eastbound					Wing Street Westbound					Chestnut Avenue Northbound				
	U-Turn	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Right	Peds	Int. Total
5:00 PM	0	12	1	0	13	0	3	17	0	20	0	0	5	0	38
5:15 PM	0	22	0	0	22	0	12	21	2	33	0	2	14	3	71
5:30 PM	0	13	0	0	13	0	13	24	0	37	0	2	10	1	62
5:45 PM	0	20	2	0	22	2	16	17	1	35	0	0	15	1	72
Total	0	67	3	0	70	2	44	79	3	125	0	4	44	5	243
Approach %	0.0	95.7	4.3	-	-	1.6	35.2	63.2	-	-	0.0	8.3	91.7	-	-
Total %	0.0	27.6	1.2	-	28.8	0.8	18.1	32.5	-	51.4	0.0	1.6	18.1	-	19.8
PHF	0.000	0.761	0.375	-	0.795	0.250	0.688	0.823	-	0.845	0.000	0.500	0.733	-	0.844
Lights	0	67	3	-	70	2	41	79	-	122	0	3	44	-	239
% Lights	-	100.0	100.0	-	100.0	100.0	93.2	100.0	-	97.6	-	75.0	100.0	-	98.4
Buses	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	-	0
% Buses	-	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	-	0.0
Single-Unit Trucks	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	-	0
% Single-Unit Trucks	-	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	-	0.0
Articulated Trucks	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	1	0	-	1
% Articulated Trucks	-	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	25.0	0.0	-	0.4
Bicycles on Road	0	0	0	-	0	0	3	0	-	3	0	0	0	-	3
% Bicycles on Road	-	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	6.8	0.0	-	2.4	-	0.0	0.0	-	1.2
Pedestrians	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	5	-
% Pedestrians	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100.0	-	-	-	-	100.0	-

Arlington Heights, IL Weather: Warm and Dry
 Highland Ave and Lower Level Garage Access
 Wednesday June 27, 2018

07/02/18
 11:39:45

URNS/TEAPAC[Ver 3.61.12] - 60-Minute Volumes: by Movement

Intersection # 1 highland/lowerlevelgar													
Begin Time	N-Approach			E-Approach			S-Approach			W-Approach			Int Total
	RT	TH	LT	RT	TH	LT	RT	TH	LT	RT	TH	LT	
700	0	59	38	25	0	5	25	52	0	0	0	0	204
715	0	56	38	20	0	7	20	45	0	0	0	0	186
730	0	53	37	13	0	8	21	35	0	0	0	0	167
745	0	52	32	14	0	11	12	42	0	0	0	0	163
800	0	35	17	13	0	12	10	52	0	0	0	0	139
815	0	25	9	12	0	8	7	46	0	0	0	0	107*
830	0	15	3	10	0	6	5	41	0	0	0	0	80*
845	0	9	2	4	0	3	3	22	0	0	0	0	43*

1600	0	45	18	18	0	17	2	53	0	0	0	0	153
1615	0	51	22	23	0	19	3	68	0	0	0	0	186
1630	0	54	23	19	0	20	7	67	0	0	0	0	190
1645	0	61	25	24	0	19	6	74	0	0	0	0	209
1700	0	65	26	39	0	25	8	97	0	0	0	0	260
1715	0	52	20	31	0	21	7	73	0	0	0	0	204*
1730	0	42	15	28	0	18	3	58	0	0	0	0	164*
1745	0	21	7	16	0	9	3	32	0	0	0	0	88*
=====													

URNS/TEAPAC[Ver 3.61.12] - 60-Minute Volumes: Appr/Exit Totals

Intersection # 1 highland/lowerlevelgar									
Begin Time	Approach Totals				Exit Totals				Int Total
	N	E	S	W	N	E	S	W	
700	97	30	77	0	77	63	64	0	204
715	94	27	65	0	65	58	63	0	186
730	90	21	56	0	48	58	61	0	167
745	84	25	54	0	56	44	63	0	163
800	52	25	62	0	65	27	47	0	139
815	34	20	53	0	58	16	33	0	107*
830	18	16	46	0	51	8	21	0	80*
845	11	7	25	0	26	5	12	0	43*

1600	63	35	55	0	71	20	62	0	153
1615	73	42	71	0	91	25	70	0	186
1630	77	39	74	0	86	30	74	0	190
1645	86	43	80	0	98	31	80	0	209
1700	91	64	105	0	136	34	90	0	260
1715	72	52	80	0	104	27	73	0	204*
1730	57	46	61	0	86	18	60	0	164*
1745	28	25	35	0	48	10	30	0	88*
=====									

Arlington Heights, IL Weather: Warm and Dry
 Highland Ave and Garage Ramp Access
 Wednesday June 27, 2018

07/02/18
 11:42:01

URNS/TEAPAC[Ver 3.61.12] - 60-Minute Volumes: by Movement

Intersection # 2 highland/garageramp													
Begin Time	N-Approach			E-Approach			S-Approach			W-Approach			Int Total
	RT	TH	LT	RT	TH	LT	RT	TH	LT	RT	TH	LT	
700	0	0	9	19	0	22	25	0	0	0	0	0	75
715	0	0	7	17	0	18	20	0	0	0	0	0	62
730	0	0	7	12	0	14	22	0	0	0	0	0	55
745	0	0	8	13	0	10	17	0	0	0	0	0	48
800	0	0	4	15	0	8	6	0	0	0	0	0	33
815	0	0	3	12	0	5	6	0	0	0	0	0	26*
830	0	0	1	12	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	18*
845	0	0	0	6	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	9*

1600	0	0	9	7	0	13	8	0	0	0	0	0	37
1615	0	0	9	10	0	18	10	0	0	0	0	0	47
1630	0	0	10	9	0	18	14	0	0	0	0	0	51
1645	0	0	11	10	0	25	10	0	0	0	0	0	56
1700	0	0	11	15	0	32	15	0	0	0	0	0	73
1715	0	0	10	10	0	26	13	0	0	0	0	0	59*
1730	0	0	8	9	0	22	8	0	0	0	0	0	47*
1745	0	0	3	6	0	11	7	0	0	0	0	0	27*
=====													

URNS/TEAPAC[Ver 3.61.12] - 60-Minute Volumes: Appr/Exit Totals

Intersection # 2 highland/garageramp									
Begin Time	Approach Totals				Exit Totals				Int Total
	N	E	S	W	N	E	S	W	
700	9	41	25	0	19	34	22	0	75
715	7	35	20	0	17	27	18	0	62
730	7	26	22	0	12	29	14	0	55
745	8	23	17	0	13	25	10	0	48
800	4	23	6	0	15	10	8	0	33
815	3	17	6	0	12	9	5	0	26*
830	1	15	2	0	12	3	3	0	18*
845	0	7	2	0	6	2	1	0	9*

1600	9	20	8	0	7	17	13	0	37
1615	9	28	10	0	10	19	18	0	47
1630	10	27	14	0	9	24	18	0	51
1645	11	35	10	0	10	21	25	0	56
1700	11	47	15	0	15	26	32	0	73
1715	10	36	13	0	10	23	26	0	59*
1730	8	31	8	0	9	16	22	0	47*
1745	3	17	7	0	6	10	11	0	27*
=====									



Kenig Lindgren O'Hara Aboona, Inc.
9575 W. Higgins Rd., Suite 400

Rosemont, Illinois, United States 60018
(847)518-9990

Count Name: Sigwalt/Vail
Site Code:
Start Date: 05/18/2017
Page No: 1

Turning Movement Data

Start Time	Sigwalt Street Eastbound					App. Total	Sigwalt Street Westbound					Vail Avenue Northbound					Vail Avenue Southbound					App. Total	Int. Total		
	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds		U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds				
7:00 AM	0	10	52	1	4	63	0	1	24	15	2	40	0	1	17	1	2	19	0	9	2	1	1	12	134
7:15 AM	0	2	33	1	1	36	0	2	18	6	0	26	0	1	8	4	3	13	0	14	7	1	0	22	97
7:30 AM	0	10	61	3	3	74	0	5	28	15	1	48	0	3	13	6	0	22	0	16	6	0	2	22	166
7:45 AM	0	8	73	2	6	83	0	3	37	14	2	54	0	4	23	2	4	29	0	23	15	1	0	39	205
Hourly Total	0	30	219	7	14	256	0	11	107	50	5	168	0	9	61	13	9	83	0	62	30	3	3	95	602
8:00 AM	0	2	44	0	2	46	0	1	35	11	0	47	0	3	13	4	0	20	0	16	10	2	4	28	141
8:15 AM	0	1	35	1	2	37	0	1	25	8	3	34	0	1	5	2	0	8	0	12	8	1	4	21	100
8:30 AM	0	1	31	2	0	34	0	1	27	4	1	32	0	1	9	3	0	13	0	14	7	3	0	24	103
8:45 AM	0	3	32	1	0	36	0	2	31	11	0	44	0	1	6	3	2	10	0	16	5	3	0	24	114
Hourly Total	0	7	142	4	4	153	0	5	118	34	4	157	0	6	33	12	2	51	0	58	30	9	8	97	458
*** BREAK ***	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
4:00 PM	0	2	41	2	5	45	0	2	41	28	0	71	0	0	14	2	5	16	1	23	14	8	6	46	178
4:15 PM	0	2	34	3	5	39	0	1	34	20	2	55	0	0	14	2	0	16	1	17	8	5	6	31	141
4:30 PM	0	4	39	0	6	43	0	4	50	30	5	84	0	1	12	0	1	13	0	19	13	5	6	37	177
4:45 PM	0	5	37	1	0	43	0	2	44	26	2	72	0	1	10	3	2	14	1	18	12	8	6	39	168
Hourly Total	0	13	151	6	16	170	0	9	169	104	9	282	0	2	50	7	8	59	3	77	47	26	24	153	664
5:00 PM	0	4	39	1	6	44	0	1	52	28	2	81	0	3	13	2	2	18	0	21	13	11	3	45	188
5:15 PM	0	3	44	0	3	47	0	6	57	17	0	80	0	5	14	8	2	27	0	17	4	8	0	29	183
5:30 PM	0	5	40	1	4	46	0	4	47	25	5	76	0	3	18	4	3	25	0	19	17	9	5	45	192
5:45 PM	1	11	36	2	5	50	0	4	47	29	5	80	0	4	18	4	7	26	0	22	10	11	6	43	199
Hourly Total	1	23	159	4	18	187	0	15	203	99	12	317	0	15	63	18	14	96	0	79	44	39	14	162	762
Grand Total	1	73	671	21	52	766	0	40	597	287	30	924	0	32	207	50	33	289	3	276	151	77	49	507	2486
Approach %	0.1	9.5	87.6	2.7	-	-	0.0	4.3	64.6	31.1	-	-	0.0	11.1	71.6	17.3	-	-	0.6	54.4	29.8	15.2	-	-	-
Total %	0.0	2.9	27.0	0.8	-	30.8	0.0	1.6	24.0	11.5	-	37.2	0.0	1.3	8.3	2.0	-	11.6	0.1	11.1	6.1	3.1	-	20.4	-
Lights	1	71	654	20	-	746	0	38	585	283	-	906	0	32	203	48	-	283	3	268	147	77	-	495	2430
% Lights	100.0	97.3	97.5	95.2	-	97.4	-	95.0	98.0	98.6	-	98.1	-	100.0	98.1	96.0	-	97.9	100.0	97.1	97.4	100.0	-	97.6	97.7
Buses	0	0	2	0	-	2	0	1	1	0	-	2	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	1	1	0	-	2	6
% Buses	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.0	-	0.3	-	2.5	0.2	0.0	-	0.2	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.7	0.0	-	0.4	0.2
Single-Unit Trucks	0	0	9	1	-	10	0	0	8	4	-	12	0	0	2	0	-	2	0	5	1	0	-	6	30
% Single-Unit Trucks	0.0	0.0	1.3	4.8	-	1.3	-	0.0	1.3	1.4	-	1.3	-	0.0	1.0	0.0	-	0.7	0.0	1.8	0.7	0.0	-	1.2	1.2
Articulated Trucks	0	1	0	0	-	1	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	1
% Articulated Trucks	0.0	1.4	0.0	0.0	-	0.1	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0
Bicycles on Road	0	1	6	0	-	7	0	1	3	0	-	4	0	0	2	2	-	4	0	2	2	0	-	4	19
% Bicycles on Road	0.0	1.4	0.9	0.0	-	0.9	-	2.5	0.5	0.0	-	0.4	-	0.0	1.0	4.0	-	1.4	0.0	0.7	1.3	0.0	-	0.8	0.8
Pedestrians	-	-	-	-	52	-	-	-	-	-	-	30	-	-	-	-	-	33	-	-	-	-	-	49	-



Kenig Lindgren O'Hara Aboona, Inc.
9575 W. Higgins Rd., Suite 400

Rosemont, Illinois, United States 60018
(847)518-9990

Count Name: Sigwalt/Vail
Site Code:
Start Date: 05/18/2017
Page No: 3

Turning Movement Peak Hour Data (7:30 AM)

Start Time	Sigwalt Street Eastbound						Sigwalt Street Westbound						Vail Avenue Northbound						Vail Avenue Southbound						Int. Total
	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	
7:30 AM	0	10	61	3	3	74	0	5	28	15	1	48	0	3	13	6	0	22	0	16	6	0	2	22	166
7:45 AM	0	8	73	2	6	83	0	3	37	14	2	54	0	4	23	2	4	29	0	23	15	1	0	39	205
8:00 AM	0	2	44	0	2	46	0	1	35	11	0	47	0	3	13	4	0	20	0	16	10	2	4	28	141
8:15 AM	0	1	35	1	2	37	0	1	25	8	3	34	0	1	5	2	0	8	0	12	8	1	4	21	100
Total	0	21	213	6	13	240	0	10	125	48	6	183	0	11	54	14	4	79	0	67	39	4	10	110	612
Approach %	0.0	8.8	88.8	2.5	-	-	0.0	5.5	68.3	26.2	-	-	0.0	13.9	68.4	17.7	-	-	0.0	60.9	35.5	3.6	-	-	-
Total %	0.0	3.4	34.8	1.0	-	39.2	0.0	1.6	20.4	7.8	-	29.9	0.0	1.8	8.8	2.3	-	12.9	0.0	10.9	6.4	0.7	-	18.0	-
PHF	0.000	0.525	0.729	0.500	-	0.723	0.000	0.500	0.845	0.800	-	0.847	0.000	0.688	0.587	0.583	-	0.681	0.000	0.728	0.650	0.500	-	0.705	0.746
Lights	0	20	210	6	-	236	0	8	123	45	-	176	0	11	52	13	-	76	0	66	36	4	-	106	594
% Lights	-	95.2	98.6	100.0	-	98.3	-	80.0	98.4	93.8	-	96.2	-	100.0	96.3	92.9	-	96.2	-	98.5	92.3	100.0	-	96.4	97.1
Buses	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	1	1	0	-	2	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	1	0	-	1	3
% Buses	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	10.0	0.8	0.0	-	1.1	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	2.6	0.0	-	0.9	0.5
Single-Unit Trucks	0	0	1	0	-	1	0	0	1	3	-	4	0	0	1	0	-	1	0	1	1	0	-	2	8
% Single-Unit Trucks	-	0.0	0.5	0.0	-	0.4	-	0.0	0.8	6.3	-	2.2	-	0.0	1.9	0.0	-	1.3	-	1.5	2.6	0.0	-	1.8	1.3
Articulated Trucks	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0
% Articulated Trucks	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0
Bicycles on Road	0	1	2	0	-	3	0	1	0	0	-	1	0	0	1	1	-	2	0	0	1	0	-	1	7
% Bicycles on Road	-	4.8	0.9	0.0	-	1.3	-	10.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.5	-	0.0	1.9	7.1	-	2.5	-	0.0	2.6	0.0	-	0.9	1.1
Pedestrians	-	-	-	-	13	-	-	-	-	-	6	-	-	-	-	-	4	-	-	-	-	-	10	-	-
% Pedestrians	-	-	-	-	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	100.0	-	-



Kenig Lindgren O'Hara Aboona, Inc.
9575 W. Higgins Rd., Suite 400

Rosemont, Illinois, United States 60018
(847)518-9990

Count Name: Sigwalt/Vail
Site Code:
Start Date: 05/18/2017
Page No: 4

Turning Movement Peak Hour Data (5:00 PM)

Start Time	Sigwalt Street Eastbound						Sigwalt Street Westbound						Vail Avenue Northbound						Vail Avenue Southbound						
	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	Int. Total
5:00 PM	0	4	39	1	6	44	0	1	52	28	2	81	0	3	13	2	2	18	0	21	13	11	3	45	188
5:15 PM	0	3	44	0	3	47	0	6	57	17	0	80	0	5	14	8	2	27	0	17	4	8	0	29	183
5:30 PM	0	5	40	1	4	46	0	4	47	25	5	76	0	3	18	4	3	25	0	19	17	9	5	45	192
5:45 PM	1	11	36	2	5	50	0	4	47	29	5	80	0	4	18	4	7	26	0	22	10	11	6	43	199
Total	1	23	159	4	18	187	0	15	203	99	12	317	0	15	63	18	14	96	0	79	44	39	14	162	762
Approach %	0.5	12.3	85.0	2.1	-	-	0.0	4.7	64.0	31.2	-	-	0.0	15.6	65.6	18.8	-	-	0.0	48.8	27.2	24.1	-	-	-
Total %	0.1	3.0	20.9	0.5	-	24.5	0.0	2.0	26.6	13.0	-	41.6	0.0	2.0	8.3	2.4	-	12.6	0.0	10.4	5.8	5.1	-	21.3	-
PHF	0.250	0.523	0.903	0.500	-	0.935	0.000	0.625	0.890	0.853	-	0.978	0.000	0.750	0.875	0.563	-	0.889	0.000	0.898	0.647	0.886	-	0.900	0.957
Lights	1	23	155	4	-	183	0	15	197	99	-	311	0	15	62	17	-	94	0	77	44	39	-	160	748
% Lights	100.0	100.0	97.5	100.0	-	97.9	-	100.0	97.0	100.0	-	98.1	-	100.0	98.4	94.4	-	97.9	-	97.5	100.0	100.0	-	98.8	98.2
Buses	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0
% Buses	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0
Single-Unit Trucks	0	0	2	0	-	2	0	0	4	0	-	4	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	6
% Single-Unit Trucks	0.0	0.0	1.3	0.0	-	1.1	-	0.0	2.0	0.0	-	1.3	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.8
Articulated Trucks	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0
% Articulated Trucks	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0
Bicycles on Road	0	0	2	0	-	2	0	0	2	0	-	2	0	0	1	1	-	2	0	2	0	0	-	2	8
% Bicycles on Road	0.0	0.0	1.3	0.0	-	1.1	-	0.0	1.0	0.0	-	0.6	-	0.0	1.6	5.6	-	2.1	-	2.5	0.0	0.0	-	1.2	1.0
Pedestrians	-	-	-	-	18	-	-	-	-	-	12	-	-	-	-	-	-	14	-	-	-	-	14	-	-
% Pedestrians	-	-	-	-	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	100.0	-	-	-	-	100.0	-	-



Kenig Lindgren O'Hara Aboona, Inc.
9575 W. Higgins Rd., Suite 400

Rosemont, Illinois, United States 60018
(847)518-9990

Count Name: Campbell Street with Chestnut
Avenue
Site Code:
Start Date: 02/07/2019
Page No: 1

Turning Movement Data

Start Time	Campbell Street Eastbound						Campbell Street Westbound						Chestnut Avenue Northbound						Chestnut Avenue Southbound					
	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total
4:00 PM	0	1	30	4	0	35	0	0	26	4	0	30	0	1	0	2	0	3	0	1	1	6	0	8
4:15 PM	0	6	37	3	2	46	0	0	22	3	1	25	0	1	1	2	4	4	0	0	2	5	2	7
4:30 PM	0	1	40	1	0	42	0	0	26	2	1	28	0	0	4	0	3	4	0	2	5	4	0	11
4:45 PM	0	5	47	2	1	54	1	0	28	4	2	33	0	2	1	0	1	3	0	1	3	5	0	9
Hourly Total	0	13	154	10	3	177	1	0	102	13	4	116	0	4	6	4	8	14	0	4	11	20	2	35
5:00 PM	0	7	47	2	0	56	1	0	37	3	1	41	0	3	2	1	0	6	0	6	1	3	0	10
5:15 PM	0	8	50	2	0	60	1	3	26	13	5	43	0	0	4	0	2	4	0	2	7	3	5	12
5:30 PM	0	7	32	5	0	44	1	3	38	8	2	50	0	4	0	3	1	7	0	1	0	7	4	8
5:45 PM	0	10	64	3	0	77	0	3	24	8	3	35	0	0	2	1	5	3	0	5	2	8	7	15
Hourly Total	0	32	193	12	0	237	3	9	125	32	11	169	0	7	8	5	8	20	0	14	10	21	16	45
6:00 PM	0	9	29	3	1	41	0	2	42	11	2	55	0	1	2	3	0	6	0	5	4	12	3	21
6:15 PM	0	2	35	0	0	37	2	2	23	2	1	29	0	1	5	0	1	6	0	0	2	5	6	7
6:30 PM	0	3	32	2	0	37	1	0	25	7	0	33	0	2	2	1	0	5	0	1	3	7	1	11
6:45 PM	0	4	23	0	0	27	1	3	14	10	3	28	0	1	3	4	0	8	0	3	5	2	5	10
Hourly Total	0	18	119	5	1	142	4	7	104	30	6	145	0	5	12	8	1	25	0	9	14	26	15	49
7:00 PM	0	1	20	2	0	23	0	0	21	8	0	29	0	2	1	1	4	4	0	11	3	3	0	17
7:15 PM	0	2	19	0	0	21	0	0	12	5	0	17	0	3	2	2	0	7	0	4	3	2	2	9
7:30 PM	0	2	19	0	0	21	0	4	20	6	0	30	0	0	1	3	1	4	0	1	2	4	3	7
7:45 PM	1	4	26	1	1	32	0	2	9	2	0	13	0	2	0	1	0	3	0	3	2	2	0	7
Hourly Total	1	9	84	3	1	97	0	6	62	21	0	89	0	7	4	7	5	18	0	19	10	11	5	40
8:00 PM	0	0	16	0	0	16	2	1	17	2	0	22	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	2	2	1	0	5
8:15 PM	0	3	13	0	0	16	0	0	22	4	0	26	0	1	2	2	1	5	0	3	3	1	2	7
8:30 PM	0	0	6	0	0	6	0	2	15	1	0	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	4
8:45 PM	0	2	8	0	0	10	0	0	18	0	0	18	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	4	0	6
Hourly Total	0	5	43	0	0	48	2	3	72	7	0	84	0	1	3	3	1	7	0	8	7	7	2	22
9:00 PM	0	0	10	0	0	10	0	1	11	2	0	14	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	1
9:15 PM	0	3	11	1	0	15	0	1	17	0	0	18	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	1	2	2	1	5
9:30 PM	0	0	4	2	0	6	0	1	23	6	1	30	0	1	0	4	0	5	0	1	0	1	1	2
9:45 PM	0	0	6	0	0	6	0	0	9	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	1	5
Hourly Total	0	3	31	3	0	37	0	3	60	8	1	71	0	5	0	4	0	9	0	2	4	7	4	13
*** BREAK ***	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
4:00 PM	0	2	42	5	0	49	0	0	29	2	0	31	0	0	3	1	0	4	0	1	2	3	1	6
4:15 PM	0	5	32	1	0	38	0	1	34	3	2	38	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	2	7	1	10
4:30 PM	0	3	34	3	0	40	1	1	27	0	0	28	0	2	3	0	2	5	0	4	1	3	1	8
4:45 PM	0	4	42	1	0	47	1	0	30	7	2	38	0	2	2	1	2	0	0	4	1	1	0	6
Hourly Total	0	14	150	10	0	174	2	2	120	12	6	136	0	4	8	3	3	15	0	10	6	14	3	30
5:00 PM	0	8	41	3	0	52	1	1	27	5	0	34	0	2	3	0	0	5	0	3	2	4	0	9

5:15 PM	0	6	34	5	0	45	0	4	35	4	0	43	0	2	3	3	0	8	0	1	4	4	3	9	105
5:30 PM	0	9	37	3	2	49	0	2	30	6	1	38	0	1	2	2	1	5	0	3	3	5	3	11	103
5:45 PM	0	8	42	2	0	52	0	0	22	10	0	32	0	1	6	3	0	10	0	3	5	9	1	17	111
Hourly Total	0	31	154	13	2	198	1	7	114	25	1	147	0	6	14	8	1	28	0	10	14	22	7	46	419
6:00 PM	0	2	24	2	1	28	2	2	30	9	3	43	0	1	3	6	1	10	0	10	3	10	3	23	104
6:15 PM	0	7	42	1	0	50	0	4	21	4	3	29	0	1	1	0	3	2	0	8	2	5	4	15	96
6:30 PM	0	3	28	3	0	34	0	1	21	8	3	30	0	2	2	1	2	5	0	11	3	5	0	19	88
6:45 PM	0	5	37	0	0	42	3	7	19	9	2	38	0	1	5	4	2	10	0	8	3	5	0	16	106
Hourly Total	0	17	131	6	1	154	5	14	91	30	11	140	0	5	11	11	8	27	0	37	11	25	7	73	394
7:00 PM	0	4	38	3	0	45	2	2	22	12	3	38	0	0	0	4	8	4	0	2	6	5	2	13	100
7:15 PM	0	6	20	1	0	27	1	4	28	6	0	39	0	0	2	7	5	9	0	4	1	1	1	6	81
7:30 PM	0	1	27	1	0	29	1	1	15	6	0	23	0	0	2	2	2	4	0	6	0	8	2	14	70
7:45 PM	0	1	17	1	0	19	3	0	18	8	5	29	0	0	4	1	2	5	0	7	4	1	0	12	65
Hourly Total	0	12	102	6	0	120	7	7	83	32	8	129	0	0	8	14	17	22	0	19	11	15	5	45	316
8:00 PM	0	3	15	0	0	18	1	1	16	14	0	32	0	1	1	1	1	3	0	7	1	2	1	10	63
8:15 PM	0	1	15	0	3	16	0	0	8	7	0	15	0	0	0	3	3	3	0	3	2	2	1	7	41
8:30 PM	0	0	14	0	0	14	0	1	10	5	1	16	0	1	3	1	0	5	0	1	1	1	0	3	37
8:45 PM	0	2	10	1	0	13	1	1	10	6	0	18	0	2	1	1	1	4	0	0	1	1	2	2	3
Hourly Total	0	6	54	1	3	61	2	3	44	32	1	81	0	4	5	6	5	15	0	11	5	6	4	22	179
9:00 PM	0	1	16	0	0	17	1	0	12	5	1	18	0	1	2	2	4	5	0	0	0	1	0	1	41
9:15 PM	0	2	13	2	0	17	2	1	15	5	1	23	0	3	1	2	1	6	0	3	1	3	0	7	53
9:30 PM	0	0	9	0	1	9	1	1	6	0	1	8	0	0	1	2	0	3	0	0	5	1	0	6	26
9:45 PM	0	0	11	0	0	11	0	2	12	5	0	19	0	0	2	5	1	7	0	1	2	3	2	6	43
Hourly Total	0	3	49	2	1	54	4	4	45	15	3	68	0	4	6	11	6	21	0	4	8	8	2	20	163
*** BREAK ***	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
4:00 PM	0	3	36	0	0	39	1	0	27	1	0	29	0	2	1	0	2	3	0	2	2	3	3	7	78
4:15 PM	0	1	27	0	0	28	0	0	16	1	3	17	0	0	1	2	0	3	0	2	2	1	0	5	53
4:30 PM	0	1	27	4	0	32	0	0	22	6	1	28	0	0	0	1	3	1	0	0	1	2	0	3	64
4:45 PM	0	3	39	1	1	43	2	2	19	2	0	25	0	0	2	3	2	5	0	4	4	1	2	9	82
Hourly Total	0	8	129	5	1	142	3	2	84	10	4	99	0	2	4	6	7	12	0	8	9	7	5	24	277
5:00 PM	0	1	32	2	0	35	1	1	28	7	0	37	0	2	2	2	0	6	1	9	3	2	1	15	93
5:15 PM	0	5	31	4	1	40	2	1	24	5	1	32	0	2	1	4	2	7	0	11	2	4	6	17	96
5:30 PM	0	5	41	1	0	47	1	1	21	6	0	29	0	1	2	2	0	5	0	5	1	3	2	9	90
5:45 PM	0	4	43	2	0	49	2	1	12	12	0	27	0	0	3	3	0	6	0	14	4	3	0	21	103
Hourly Total	0	15	147	9	1	171	6	4	85	30	1	125	0	5	8	11	2	24	1	39	10	12	9	62	382
6:00 PM	0	2	31	1	1	34	1	3	21	6	1	31	0	1	2	2	4	5	0	6	3	4	1	13	83
6:15 PM	0	1	39	0	2	40	0	4	19	9	0	32	0	1	1	0	7	2	0	7	1	3	2	11	85
6:30 PM	0	6	27	1	0	34	2	3	18	8	0	31	0	3	2	3	3	8	0	5	2	1	1	8	81
6:45 PM	0	3	33	1	0	37	1	6	21	6	0	34	0	0	0	2	5	2	0	7	3	5	2	15	88
Hourly Total	0	12	130	3	3	145	4	16	79	29	1	128	0	5	5	7	19	17	0	25	9	13	6	47	337
7:00 PM	0	3	26	1	0	30	0	2	23	18	0	43	0	2	3	1	2	6	0	7	1	3	4	11	90
7:15 PM	0	4	20	4	2	28	2	5	15	12	3	34	0	3	2	5	1	10	0	6	2	4	4	12	84
7:30 PM	0	5	24	4	0	33	2	2	10	9	1	23	0	1	0	0	5	1	0	7	1	2	7	10	67
7:45 PM	0	8	12	0	1	20	1	2	23	4	0	30	0	4	2	5	4	11	0	11	2	1	5	14	75
Hourly Total	0	20	82	9	3	111	5	11	71	43	4	130	0	10	7	11	12	28	0	31	6	10	20	47	316
8:00 PM	0	1	16	1	0	18	2	0	13	5	5	20	0	0	0	1	2	1	1	2	0	2	5	5	44
8:15 PM	0	3	16	2	4	21	0	2	9	8	1	19	0	0	1	5	3	6	0	3	3	0	0	6	52
8:30 PM	0	0	10	2	0	12	2	2	9	2	2	15	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	3	0	0	4	32
8:45 PM	1	0	7	0	0	8	1	1	11	2	2	15	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	3	0	3	3	26
Hourly Total	1	4	49	5	4	59	5	5	42	17	10	69	0	0	2	6	8	8	1	6	9	2	8	18	154
9:00 PM	0	1	10	1	0	12	1	2	17	2	2	22	0	2	2	2	0	6	0	2	2	0	0	4	44
9:15 PM	0	0	6	1	0	7	1	0	15	1	1	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4	0	9	33

9:30 PM	0	1	6	0	2	7	1	1	12	1	0	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	3	4	26
9:45 PM	0	0	16	1	3	17	0	1	17	3	2	21	0	1	0	1	2	2	0	3	2	0	1	45
Hourly Total	0	2	38	3	5	43	3	4	61	7	5	75	0	3	2	3	2	8	0	11	6	5	4	148
Grand Total	2	224	1839	105	29	2170	57	107	1444	393	77	2001	0	77	113	128	113	318	2	267	160	231	124	660
Approach %	0.1	10.3	84.7	4.8	-	-	2.8	5.3	72.2	19.6	-	-	0.0	24.2	35.5	40.3	-	-	0.3	40.5	24.2	35.0	-	-
Total %	0.0	4.4	35.7	2.0	-	42.1	1.1	2.1	28.0	7.6	-	38.9	0.0	1.5	2.2	2.5	-	6.2	0.0	5.2	3.1	4.5	-	12.8
Lights	2	223	1833	104	-	2162	57	107	1436	391	-	1991	0	75	113	127	-	315	2	267	159	229	-	657
% Lights	100.0	99.6	99.7	99.0	-	99.6	100.0	100.0	99.4	99.5	-	99.5	-	97.4	100.0	99.2	-	99.1	100.0	100.0	99.4	99.1	-	99.5
Buses	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	1	0	-	1	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	1	-	2
% Buses	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4	-	0.2
Single-Unit Trucks	0	0	4	0	-	4	0	0	6	2	-	8	0	2	0	1	-	3	0	0	0	1	-	16
% Single-Unit Trucks	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.0	-	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.5	-	0.4	-	2.6	0.0	0.8	-	0.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4	-	0.3
Articulated Trucks	0	0	0	1	-	1	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	1
% Articulated Trucks	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0
Bicycles on Road	0	1	2	0	-	3	0	0	1	0	-	1	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	1	0	-	5
% Bicycles on Road	0.0	0.4	0.1	0.0	-	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6	0.0	-	0.1
Pedestrians	-	-	-	-	29	-	-	-	-	-	77	-	-	-	-	-	-	113	-	-	-	-	124	-
% Pedestrians	-	-	-	-	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	100.0	-	-	-	-	100.0	-



Kenig Lindgren O'Hara Aboona, Inc.
9575 W. Higgins Rd., Suite 400

Rosemont, Illinois, United States 60018
(847)518-9990

Count Name: Campbell Street with Chestnut Avenue
Site Code:
Start Date: 02/07/2019
Page No: 4

Turning Movement Peak Hour Data (5:15 PM)

Start Time	Campbell Street Eastbound						Campbell Street Westbound						Chestnut Avenue Northbound						Chestnut Avenue Southbound						App. Total	Peds	Right	Thru	Left	U-Turn	App. Total	Peds	Right	Thru	Left	U-Turn	App. Total	Peds	Right	Thru	Left	U-Turn	App. Total	Peds	Right	Thru	Left	U-Turn	App. Total	Peds	Right	Thru	Left	U-Turn	App. Total	Peds	Right	Thru	Left	U-Turn	App. Total	Peds	Right	Thru	Left	U-Turn	App. Total	Peds	Right	Thru	Left	U-Turn	App. Total	Peds	Right	Thru	Left	U-Turn	App. Total	Peds	Right	Thru	Left	U-Turn	App. Total	Peds	Right	Thru	Left	U-Turn	App. Total	Peds	Right	Thru	Left	U-Turn	App. Total	Peds	Right	Thru	Left	U-Turn	App. Total	Peds	Right	Thru	Left	U-Turn	App. Total	Peds	Right	Thru	Left	U-Turn	App. Total	Peds	Right	Thru	Left	U-Turn	App. Total	Peds	Right	Thru	Left	U-Turn	App. Total	Peds	Right	Thru	Left	U-Turn	App. Total	Peds	Right	Thru	Left	U-Turn	App. Total	Peds	Right	Thru	Left	U-Turn	App. Total	Peds	Right	Thru	Left	U-Turn	App. Total	Peds	Right	Thru	Left	U-Turn	App. Total	Peds	Right	Thru	Left	U-Turn	App. Total	Peds	Right	Thru	Left	U-Turn	App. Total	Peds	Right	Thru	Left	U-Turn	App. Total	Peds	Right	Thru	Left	U-Turn	App. Total	Peds	Right	Thru	Left	U-Turn	App. Total	Peds	Right	Thru	Left	U-Turn	App. Total	Peds	Right	Thru	Left	U-Turn	App. Total	Peds	Right	Thru	Left	U-Turn	App. Total	Peds	Right	Thru	Left	U-Turn	App. Total	Peds	Right	Thru	Left	U-Turn	App. Total	Peds	Right	Thru	Left	U-Turn	App. Total	Peds	Right	Thru	Left	U-Turn	App. Total	Peds	Right	Thru	Left	U-Turn	App. Total	Peds	Right	Thru	Left	U-Turn	App. Total	Peds	Right	Thru	Left	U-Turn	App. Total	Peds	Right	Thru	Left	U-Turn	App. Total	Peds	Right	Thru	Left	U-Turn	App. Total	Peds	Right	Thru	Left	U-Turn	App. Total	Peds	Right	Thru	Left	U-Turn	App. Total	Peds	Right	Thru	Left	U-Turn	App. Total	Peds	Right	Thru	Left	U-Turn	App. Total	Peds	Right	Thru	Left	U-Turn	App. Total	Peds	Right	Thru	Left	U-Turn	App. Total	Peds	Right	Thru	Left	U-Turn	App. Total	Peds	Right	Thru	Left	U-Turn	App. Total	Peds	Right	Thru	Left	U-Turn	App. Total	Peds	Right	Thru	Left	U-Turn	App. Total	Peds	Right	Thru	Left	U-Turn	App. Total	Peds	Right	Thru	Left	U-Turn	App. Total	Peds	Right	Thru	Left	U-Turn	App. Total	Peds	Right	Thru	Left	U-Turn	App. Total	Peds	Right	Thru	Left	U-Turn	App. Total	Peds	Right	Thru	Left	U-Turn	App. Total	Peds	Right	Thru	Left	U-Turn	App. Total	Peds	Right	Thru	Left	U-Turn	App. Total	Peds	Right	Thru	Left	U-Turn	App. Total	Peds	Right	Thru	Left	U-Turn	App. Total	Peds	Right	Thru	Left	U-Turn	App. Total	Peds	Right	Thru	Left	U-Turn	App. Total	Peds	Right	Thru	Left	U-Turn	App. Total	Peds	Right	Thru	Left	U-Turn	App. Total	Peds	Right	Thru	Left	U-Turn	App. Total	Peds	Right	Thru	Left	U-Turn	App. Total	Peds	Right	Thru	Left	U-Turn	App. Total	Peds	Right	Thru	Left	U-Turn	App. Total	Peds	Right	Thru	Left	U-Turn	App. Total	Peds	Right	Thru	Left	U-Turn	App. Total	Peds	Right	Thru	Left	U-Turn	App. Total	Peds	Right	Thru	Left	U-Turn	App. Total	Peds	Right	Thru	Left	U-Turn	App. Total	Peds	Right	Thru	Left	U-Turn	App. Total	Peds	Right	Thru	Left	U-Turn	App. Total	Peds	Right	Thru	Left	U-Turn	App. Total	Peds	Right	Thru	Left	U-Turn	App. Total
------------	---------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	---------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	----------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	----------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	------------	------	-------	------	------	--------	------------	------	-------	------	------	--------	------------	------	-------	------	------	--------	------------	------	-------	------	------	--------	------------	------	-------	------	------	--------	------------	------	-------	------	------	--------	------------	------	-------	------	------	--------	------------	------	-------	------	------	--------	------------	------	-------	------	------	--------	------------	------	-------	------	------	--------	------------	------	-------	------	------	--------	------------	------	-------	------	------	--------	------------	------	-------	------	------	--------	------------	------	-------	------	------	--------	------------	------	-------	------	------	--------	------------	------	-------	------	------	--------	------------	------	-------	------	------	--------	------------	------	-------	------	------	--------	------------	------	-------	------	------	--------	------------	------	-------	------	------	--------	------------	------	-------	------	------	--------	------------	------	-------	------	------	--------	------------	------	-------	------	------	--------	------------	------	-------	------	------	--------	------------	------	-------	------	------	--------	------------	------	-------	------	------	--------	------------	------	-------	------	------	--------	------------	------	-------	------	------	--------	------------	------	-------	------	------	--------	------------	------	-------	------	------	--------	------------	------	-------	------	------	--------	------------	------	-------	------	------	--------	------------	------	-------	------	------	--------	------------	------	-------	------	------	--------	------------	------	-------	------	------	--------	------------	------	-------	------	------	--------	------------	------	-------	------	------	--------	------------	------	-------	------	------	--------	------------	------	-------	------	------	--------	------------	------	-------	------	------	--------	------------	------	-------	------	------	--------	------------	------	-------	------	------	--------	------------	------	-------	------	------	--------	------------	------	-------	------	------	--------	------------	------	-------	------	------	--------	------------	------	-------	------	------	--------	------------	------	-------	------	------	--------	------------	------	-------	------	------	--------	------------	------	-------	------	------	--------	------------	------	-------	------	------	--------	------------	------	-------	------	------	--------	------------	------	-------	------	------	--------	------------	------	-------	------	------	--------	------------	------	-------	------	------	--------	------------	------	-------	------	------	--------	------------	------	-------	------	------	--------	------------	------	-------	------	------	--------	------------	------	-------	------	------	--------	------------	------	-------	------	------	--------	------------	------	-------	------	------	--------	------------	------	-------	------	------	--------	------------	------	-------	------	------	--------	------------	------	-------	------	------	--------	------------	------	-------	------	------	--------	------------	------	-------	------	------	--------	------------	------	-------	------	------	--------	------------	------	-------	------	------	--------	------------	------	-------	------	------	--------	------------	------	-------	------	------	--------	------------	------	-------	------	------	--------	------------	------	-------	------	------	--------	------------	------	-------	------	------	--------	------------	------	-------	------	------	--------	------------	------	-------	------	------	--------	------------	------	-------	------	------	--------	------------	------	-------	------	------	--------	------------



Kenig Lindgren O'Hara Aboona, Inc.
9575 W. Higgins Rd., Suite 400
Rosemont, Illinois, United States 60018
(847)518-9990

Count Name: Campbell Street with Chestnut Avenue
Site Code:
Start Date: 02/07/2019
Page No.: 5

Turning Movement Peak Hour Data (5:15 PM)

Start Time	Campbell Street Eastbound						Campbell Street Westbound						Chestnut Avenue Northbound						Chestnut Avenue Southbound					
	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total
5:15 PM	0	6	34	5	0	45	0	4	35	4	0	43	0	2	3	3	0	8	0	1	4	4	3	9
5:30 PM	0	9	37	3	2	49	0	2	30	6	1	38	0	1	2	2	1	5	0	3	3	5	3	11
5:45 PM	0	8	42	2	0	52	0	0	22	10	0	32	0	1	6	3	0	10	0	3	5	9	1	17
6:00 PM	0	2	24	2	1	28	2	2	30	9	3	43	0	1	3	6	1	10	0	10	3	10	3	23
Total	0	25	137	12	3	174	2	8	117	29	4	156	0	5	14	14	2	33	0	17	15	28	10	60
Approach %	0.0	14.4	78.7	6.9	-	-	1.3	5.1	75.0	18.6	-	-	0.0	15.2	42.4	42.4	-	-	0.0	28.3	25.0	46.7	-	-
Total %	0.0	5.9	32.4	2.8	-	41.1	0.5	1.9	27.7	6.9	-	36.9	0.0	1.2	3.3	3.3	-	7.8	0.0	4.0	3.5	6.6	-	14.2
PHF	0.000	0.694	0.815	0.600	-	0.837	0.250	0.500	0.836	0.725	-	0.907	0.000	0.625	0.583	0.583	-	0.825	0.000	0.425	0.750	0.700	-	0.652
Lights	0	24	136	12	-	172	2	8	115	29	-	154	0	5	14	14	-	33	0	17	15	28	-	60
% Lights	-	96.0	99.3	100.0	-	98.9	100.0	100.0	98.3	100.0	-	98.7	-	100.0	100.0	100.0	-	100.0	-	100.0	100.0	100.0	-	100.0
Buses	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0
% Buses	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0
Single-Unit Trucks	0	0	1	0	-	1	0	0	2	0	-	2	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0
% Single-Unit Trucks	-	0.0	0.7	0.0	-	0.6	0.0	0.0	1.7	0.0	-	1.3	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0
Articulated Trucks	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0
% Articulated Trucks	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0
Bicycles on Road	0	1	0	0	-	1	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0
% Bicycles on Road	-	4.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0
Pedestrians	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	4	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	10	-
% Pedestrians	-	-	-	-	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	100.0	-



Kenig Lindgren O'Hara Aboona, Inc.
9575 W. Higgins Rd., Suite 400
Rosemont, Illinois, United States 60018
(847)518-9990

Count Name: Campbell Street with Chestnut Avenue
Site Code:
Start Date: 02/07/2019
Page No.: 6

Turning Movement Peak Hour Data (5:00 PM)

Start Time	Campbell Street Eastbound						Campbell Street Westbound						Chestnut Avenue Northbound						Chestnut Avenue Southbound						
	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	Int. Total
5:00 PM	0	1	32	2	0	35	1	1	28	7	0	37	0	2	2	2	0	6	1	9	3	2	1	15	93
5:15 PM	0	5	31	4	1	40	2	1	24	5	1	32	0	2	1	4	2	7	0	11	2	4	6	17	96
5:30 PM	0	5	41	1	0	47	1	1	21	6	0	29	0	1	2	2	0	5	0	5	1	3	2	9	90
5:45 PM	0	4	43	2	0	49	2	1	12	12	0	27	0	0	3	3	0	6	0	14	4	3	0	21	103
Total	0	15	147	9	1	171	6	4	85	30	1	125	0	5	8	11	2	24	1	39	10	12	9	62	382
Approach %	0.0	8.8	86.0	5.3	-	-	4.8	3.2	68.0	24.0	-	-	0.0	20.8	33.3	45.8	-	-	1.6	62.9	16.1	19.4	-	-	-
Total %	0.0	3.9	38.5	2.4	-	44.8	1.6	1.0	22.3	7.9	-	32.7	0.0	1.3	2.1	2.9	-	6.3	0.3	10.2	2.6	3.1	-	16.2	-
PHF	0.000	0.750	0.855	0.563	-	0.872	0.750	1.000	0.759	0.625	-	0.845	0.000	0.625	0.667	0.688	-	0.857	0.250	0.696	0.625	0.750	-	0.738	0.927
Lights	0	15	147	9	-	171	6	4	85	30	-	125	0	5	8	11	-	24	1	39	10	12	-	62	382
% Lights	-	100.0	100.0	100.0	-	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	-	100.0	-	100.0	100.0	100.0	-	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	-	100.0	100.0
Buses	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0
% Buses	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0
Single-Unit Trucks	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0
% Single-Unit Trucks	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0
Articulated Trucks	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0
% Articulated Trucks	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0	0
Bicycles on Road	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0
% Bicycles on Road	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0
Pedestrians	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	9	-	-
% Pedestrians	-	-	-	-	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	100.0	-	-



Kenig, Lindgren, O'Hara, Aboona, Inc.
9575 W. Higgins Rd., Suite 400

Rosemont, Illinois, United States 60018
(847)518-9990

Count Name: Campbell Street with Highland Avenue
Site Code: 02/07/2019
Page No: 1

Turning Movement Data

Start Time	Campbell Street Eastbound					Campbell Street Westbound					Highland Avenue Northbound				
	U-Turn	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Right	Peds	Int. Total
4:00 PM	1	27	4	1	32	1	9	24	4	34	0	5	7	1	78
4:15 PM	0	32	8	1	40	3	5	21	4	29	1	1	7	8	78
4:30 PM	0	32	7	0	39	1	4	25	9	30	1	8	10	3	88
4:45 PM	0	40	8	0	48	0	4	36	2	40	0	2	4	7	94
Hourly Total	1	131	27	2	159	5	22	106	19	133	2	16	28	19	338
5:00 PM	0	47	10	0	57	0	6	37	5	43	0	7	14	5	121
5:15 PM	0	38	11	1	49	1	15	39	10	55	0	10	13	2	127
5:30 PM	0	33	8	3	41	1	7	38	8	46	0	9	16	11	112
5:45 PM	0	47	15	0	62	2	19	35	5	56	0	9	15	9	142
Hourly Total	0	165	44	4	209	4	47	149	28	200	0	35	58	27	502
6:00 PM	0	33	5	0	38	1	12	39	15	52	1	14	23	3	128
6:15 PM	0	27	11	0	38	1	9	26	10	36	0	3	21	2	98
6:30 PM	0	32	4	0	36	2	11	26	7	39	1	9	33	6	118
6:45 PM	0	26	6	1	32	1	15	23	10	39	0	6	18	4	95
Hourly Total	0	118	26	1	144	5	47	114	42	166	2	32	95	15	439
7:00 PM	0	22	9	2	31	0	4	33	0	37	2	4	16	15	90
7:15 PM	0	20	3	0	23	1	9	15	4	25	0	6	20	2	74
7:30 PM	0	16	9	0	25	0	16	26	4	42	0	5	11	4	83
7:45 PM	0	17	11	0	28	0	9	14	0	23	0	0	12	1	63
Hourly Total	0	75	32	2	107	1	38	88	8	127	2	15	59	22	310
8:00 PM	0	17	2	0	19	0	8	16	5	24	0	5	5	4	53
8:15 PM	0	15	3	0	18	0	5	23	3	28	0	1	8	3	55
8:30 PM	0	6	3	0	9	0	0	19	1	19	0	5	10	1	43
8:45 PM	0	8	1	0	9	0	2	13	2	15	0	3	9	3	36
Hourly Total	0	46	9	0	55	0	15	71	11	86	0	14	32	11	187
9:00 PM	0	11	1	0	12	0	2	10	2	12	0	4	12	2	40
9:15 PM	0	7	6	0	13	0	2	18	8	20	0	3	8	2	44
9:30 PM	0	6	1	1	7	1	2	19	1	22	0	9	22	1	60
9:45 PM	0	3	3	1	6	0	1	6	3	7	0	5	16	4	34
Hourly Total	0	27	11	2	38	1	7	53	14	61	0	21	58	9	178
*** BREAK ***															
4:00 PM	0	32	8	0	40	0	7	27	2	34	0	3	4	4	81
4:15 PM	0	34	4	1	38	1	9	32	0	42	0	6	10	5	96
4:30 PM	0	33	5	0	38	0	1	30	1	31	0	5	11	1	85
4:45 PM	0	37	6	0	43	3	6	37	0	46	0	2	13	12	104
Hourly Total	0	136	23	1	159	4	23	126	3	153	0	16	38	22	366
5:00 PM	0	37	9	0	46	0	12	21	3	33	0	11	10	2	100
5:15 PM	0	29	14	0	43	1	18	37	1	56	0	6	11	2	116

5:30 PM	0	34	6	0	40	1	19	32	14	52	0	11	16	2	27	119
5:45 PM	0	35	9	0	44	2	16	24	3	42	0	7	23	7	30	116
Hourly Total	0	135	38	0	173	4	65	114	21	183	0	35	60	13	95	451
6:00 PM	0	36	6	0	42	0	20	32	1	52	0	11	27	5	38	132
6:15 PM	0	44	7	1	51	0	13	27	1	40	0	8	18	7	26	117
6:30 PM	0	33	7	0	40	1	8	24	3	33	0	5	10	10	15	88
6:45 PM	0	35	20	0	55	1	19	41	8	61	0	0	16	12	16	132
Hourly Total	0	148	40	1	188	2	60	124	13	186	0	24	71	34	95	469
7:00 PM	0	28	16	6	44	3	23	34	7	60	0	7	24	13	31	135
7:15 PM	0	22	10	0	32	0	18	29	3	47	0	7	34	9	41	120
7:30 PM	0	27	9	0	36	0	14	20	2	34	1	1	23	7	25	95
7:45 PM	0	21	8	0	29	2	6	23	4	31	0	9	11	13	20	80
Hourly Total	0	98	43	6	141	5	61	106	16	172	1	24	92	42	117	430
8:00 PM	0	21	2	0	23	2	10	23	2	35	0	7	15	9	22	80
8:15 PM	0	21	5	0	26	2	6	18	3	26	0	1	18	8	19	71
8:30 PM	0	12	4	0	16	1	4	9	2	14	0	6	16	1	22	52
8:45 PM	0	7	4	1	11	1	10	17	7	28	0	6	15	12	21	60
Hourly Total	0	61	15	1	76	6	30	67	7	103	0	20	64	30	84	263
9:00 PM	0	15	2	1	17	3	8	9	3	20	0	6	22	6	28	65
9:15 PM	0	15	4	0	19	0	6	14	1	20	0	7	10	5	17	56
9:30 PM	0	12	4	0	16	2	5	9	7	16	0	3	16	5	19	51
9:45 PM	0	9	1	0	10	0	6	13	7	19	0	9	17	15	26	55
Hourly Total	0	51	11	1	62	5	25	45	18	75	0	25	65	31	90	227
*** BREAK ***	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
4:00 PM	0	34	3	0	37	3	6	24	7	33	0	4	11	8	15	85
4:15 PM	0	30	3	0	33	1	9	13	6	23	0	6	14	5	20	76
4:30 PM	0	33	7	0	40	0	1	17	5	27	1	12	7	1	20	87
4:45 PM	0	33	5	0	38	2	10	23	15	35	1	4	3	8	8	81
Hourly Total	0	130	18	0	148	6	35	77	33	118	2	26	35	22	63	329
5:00 PM	0	34	10	1	44	0	21	28	7	49	0	8	17	5	25	118
5:15 PM	0	45	8	0	53	0	24	30	9	54	0	6	17	9	23	130
5:30 PM	0	35	12	0	47	0	21	23	2	44	0	7	16	2	23	114
5:45 PM	0	41	18	0	59	1	23	22	4	46	0	7	12	13	19	124
Hourly Total	0	155	48	1	203	1	89	103	22	193	0	28	62	29	90	486
6:00 PM	0	33	6	1	39	4	15	24	5	43	0	5	20	7	25	107
6:15 PM	0	30	15	1	45	1	19	30	8	50	0	8	21	11	29	124
6:30 PM	0	27	14	0	41	2	18	25	6	45	1	5	18	12	24	110
6:45 PM	0	25	15	0	40	1	21	34	4	56	0	5	23	9	28	124
Hourly Total	0	115	50	2	165	8	73	113	23	194	1	23	82	39	106	465
7:00 PM	0	18	12	0	30	1	35	35	2	71	0	8	22	10	30	131
7:15 PM	0	31	7	0	38	3	19	30	6	52	0	5	15	12	20	110
7:30 PM	0	31	6	0	37	0	15	22	4	37	0	8	17	16	25	99
7:45 PM	0	21	6	1	27	3	9	24	2	36	0	8	11	18	19	82
Hourly Total	0	101	31	1	132	7	78	111	14	196	0	29	65	56	94	422
8:00 PM	0	17	5	3	22	2	10	15	2	27	0	5	19	6	24	73
8:15 PM	0	20	9	0	29	1	7	20	3	28	0	4	18	10	22	79
8:30 PM	0	12	3	0	15	0	15	15	4	30	0	4	18	1	22	67
8:45 PM	0	9	2	1	11	2	12	10	6	24	0	6	27	7	33	68
Hourly Total	0	58	19	4	77	5	44	60	15	109	0	19	82	24	101	287
9:00 PM	0	8	3	0	11	5	8	16	2	29	0	5	14	4	19	59
9:15 PM	0	8	4	0	12	0	5	15	18	20	0	5	20	0	25	57
9:30 PM	0	8	0	0	8	2	4	15	1	21	0	2	20	0	22	51

9:45 PM	0	16	3	0	19	0	4	10	4	14	0	15	13	9	28	61
Hourly Total	0	40	10	0	50	7	21	56	25	84	0	27	67	13	94	228
Grand Total	1	1790	495	29	2286	76	780	1683	332	2539	10	429	1113	458	1552	6377
Approach %	0.0	78.3	21.7	-	-	3.0	30.7	66.3	-	-	0.6	27.6	71.7	-	-	-
Total %	0.0	28.1	7.8	-	35.8	1.2	12.2	26.4	-	39.8	0.2	6.7	17.5	-	24.3	-
Lights	1	1781	494	-	2276	76	779	1675	-	2530	10	429	1112	-	1551	6357
% Lights	100.0	99.5	99.8	-	99.6	100.0	99.9	99.5	-	99.6	100.0	100.0	99.9	-	99.9	99.7
Buses	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	-	0	0
% Buses	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0
Single-Unit Trucks	0	7	1	-	8	0	0	7	-	7	0	0	0	-	0	15
% Single-Unit Trucks	0.0	0.4	0.2	-	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.4	-	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.2
Articulated Trucks	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	-	0	0
% Articulated Trucks	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0
Bicycles on Road	0	2	0	-	2	0	1	1	-	2	0	0	1	-	1	5
% Bicycles on Road	0.0	0.1	0.0	-	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.1	-	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.1	-	0.1	0.1
Pedestrians	-	-	-	29	-	-	-	-	332	-	-	-	-	458	-	-
% Pedestrians	-	-	-	100.0	-	-	-	-	100.0	-	-	-	-	100.0	-	-



Kenig Lindgren O'Hara Aboona, Inc.
9575 W. Higgins Rd., Suite 400

Rosemont, Illinois, United States 60018
(847)518-9990

Count Name: Campbell Street with Highland Avenue
Site Code:
Start Date: 02/07/2019
Page No: 4

Turning Movement Peak Hour Data (5:15 PM)

Start Time	Campbell Street Eastbound					Campbell Street Westbound					Highland Avenue Northbound				
	U-Turn	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Right	Peds	Int. Total
5:15 PM	0	38	11	1	49	1	15	39	10	55	0	10	13	2	127
5:30 PM	0	33	8	3	41	1	7	38	8	46	0	9	16	11	112
5:45 PM	0	47	15	0	62	2	19	35	5	56	0	9	15	9	142
6:00 PM	0	33	5	0	38	1	12	39	15	52	1	14	23	3	128
Total	0	151	39	4	190	5	53	151	38	209	1	42	67	25	509
Approach %	0.0	79.5	20.5	-	-	2.4	25.4	72.2	-	-	0.9	38.2	60.9	-	-
Total %	0.0	29.7	7.7	-	37.3	1.0	10.4	29.7	-	41.1	0.2	8.3	13.2	-	-
PHF	0.000	0.803	0.650	-	0.766	0.625	0.697	0.968	-	0.933	0.250	0.750	0.728	-	0.896
Lights	0	150	39	-	189	5	52	150	-	207	1	42	67	-	506
% Lights	-	99.3	100.0	-	99.5	100.0	98.1	99.3	-	99.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	-	99.4
Buses	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	-	0
% Buses	-	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0
Single-Unit Trucks	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	1	-	1	0	0	0	-	1
% Single-Unit Trucks	-	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7	-	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.2
Articulated Trucks	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	-	0
% Articulated Trucks	-	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0
Bicycles on Road	0	1	0	-	1	0	1	0	-	1	0	0	0	-	2
% Bicycles on Road	-	0.7	0.0	-	0.5	0.0	1.9	0.0	-	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.4
Pedestrians	-	-	-	4	-	-	-	-	38	-	-	-	-	25	-
% Pedestrians	-	-	-	100.0	-	-	-	-	100.0	-	-	-	-	100.0	-



Kenig Lindgren O'Hara Aboona, Inc.
9575 W. Higgins Rd., Suite 400

Rosemont, Illinois, United States 60018
(847)518-9990

Count Name: Campbell Street with Highland Avenue
Site Code:
Start Date: 02/07/2019
Page No.: 5

Turning Movement Peak Hour Data (5:30 PM)

Start Time	Campbell Street Eastbound					Campbell Street Westbound					Highland Avenue Northbound				
	U-Turn	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Right	Peds	Int. Total
5:30 PM	0	34	6	0	40	1	19	32	14	52	0	11	16	2	119
5:45 PM	0	35	9	0	44	2	16	24	3	42	0	7	23	7	116
6:00 PM	0	36	6	0	42	0	20	32	1	52	0	11	27	5	132
6:15 PM	0	44	7	1	51	0	13	27	1	40	0	8	18	7	117
Total	0	149	28	1	177	3	68	115	19	186	0	37	84	21	484
Approach %	0.0	84.2	15.8	-	-	1.6	36.6	61.8	-	-	0.0	30.6	69.4	-	-
Total %	0.0	30.8	5.8	-	36.6	0.6	14.0	23.8	-	38.4	0.0	7.6	17.4	-	25.0
PHF	0.000	0.847	0.778	-	0.868	0.375	0.850	0.898	-	0.894	0.000	0.841	0.778	-	0.917
Lights	0	149	28	-	177	3	68	115	-	186	0	37	84	-	484
% Lights	-	100.0	100.0	-	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	-	100.0	-	100.0	100.0	-	100.0
Buses	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	-	0
% Buses	-	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	-	0.0
Single-Unit Trucks	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	-	0
% Single-Unit Trucks	-	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	-	0.0
Articulated Trucks	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	-	0
% Articulated Trucks	-	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	-	0.0
Bicycles on Road	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	-	0
% Bicycles on Road	-	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	-	0.0
Pedestrians	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	19	-	-	-	-	21	-
% Pedestrians	-	-	-	100.0	-	-	-	-	100.0	-	-	-	-	100.0	-



Kenig Lindgren O'Hara Aboona, Inc.
9575 W. Higgins Rd., Suite 400

Rosemont, Illinois, United States 60018
(847)518-9990

Count Name: Campbell Street with Highland Avenue
Site Code:
Start Date: 02/07/2019
Page No.: 6

Turning Movement Peak Hour Data (6:15 PM)

Start Time	Campbell Street Eastbound					Campbell Street Westbound					Highland Avenue Northbound				
	U-Turn	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Right	Peds	Int. Total
6:15 PM	0	30	15	1	45	1	19	30	8	50	0	8	21	11	29
6:30 PM	0	27	14	0	41	2	18	25	6	45	1	5	18	12	24
6:45 PM	0	25	15	0	40	1	21	34	4	56	0	5	23	9	28
7:00 PM	0	18	12	0	30	1	35	35	2	71	0	8	22	10	30
Total	0	100	56	1	156	5	93	124	20	222	1	26	84	42	111
Approach %	0.0	64.1	35.9	-	-	2.3	41.9	55.9	-	-	0.9	23.4	75.7	-	-
Total %	0.0	20.4	11.5	-	31.9	1.0	19.0	25.4	-	45.4	0.2	5.3	17.2	-	22.7
PHF	0.000	0.833	0.933	-	0.867	0.625	0.664	0.886	-	0.782	0.250	0.813	0.913	-	0.933
Lights	0	100	56	-	156	5	93	124	-	222	1	26	84	-	111
% Lights	-	100.0	100.0	-	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	-	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	-	100.0
Buses	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	-	0
% Buses	-	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0
Single-Unit Trucks	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	-	0
% Single-Unit Trucks	-	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0
Articulated Trucks	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	-	0
% Articulated Trucks	-	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0
Bicycles on Road	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	-	0
% Bicycles on Road	-	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0
Pedestrians	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	20	-	-	-	-	42	-
% Pedestrians	-	-	-	100.0	-	-	-	-	100.0	-	-	-	-	100.0	-



Kenig Lindgren O'Hara Aboona, Inc.
9575 W. Higgins Rd., Suite 400

Rosemont, Illinois, United States 60018
(847)518-9990

Count Name: Campbell Street with Vail Avenue
Site Code:
Start Date: 02/07/2019
Page No: 1

Turning Movement Data

Start Time	Campbell Street Eastbound						Campbell Street Westbound						Vail Avenue Northbound						Vail Avenue Southbound						
	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	Int. Total
4:00 PM	0	12	10	7	4	29	0	1	22	3	5	26	0	5	19	2	4	26	0	5	23	7	6	35	116
4:15 PM	0	17	20	3	23	40	0	5	18	9	14	32	0	2	20	5	11	27	0	5	34	11	5	50	149
4:30 PM	0	15	19	10	6	44	0	3	19	8	7	30	0	3	22	2	8	27	1	11	24	5	3	41	142
4:45 PM	0	8	27	7	22	42	0	8	19	7	11	34	0	5	19	1	5	25	0	11	20	15	12	46	147
Hourly Total	0	52	76	27	55	155	0	17	78	27	37	122	0	15	80	10	28	105	1	32	101	38	26	172	554
5:00 PM	0	15	26	13	20	54	0	6	25	11	10	42	0	7	22	4	5	33	0	11	29	13	1	53	182
5:15 PM	0	13	20	15	46	48	0	11	32	10	8	53	0	8	21	10	3	39	0	4	39	15	15	58	198
5:30 PM	0	17	24	17	15	58	0	6	27	6	10	39	0	10	20	8	6	38	0	6	32	12	7	50	185
5:45 PM	0	13	29	11	104	53	0	13	29	15	19	57	0	7	21	5	19	33	0	15	34	16	11	65	208
Hourly Total	0	58	99	56	185	213	0	36	113	42	47	191	0	32	84	27	33	143	0	36	134	56	34	226	773
6:00 PM	0	18	22	9	35	49	0	12	32	14	7	58	0	7	29	10	17	46	0	10	41	17	3	68	221
6:15 PM	0	13	22	8	13	43	0	6	25	8	26	39	0	1	16	4	18	21	0	7	29	7	19	43	146
6:30 PM	0	21	28	17	34	66	0	6	22	8	17	36	0	4	19	5	15	28	0	3	30	17	7	50	180
6:45 PM	0	12	14	14	14	40	0	11	20	12	11	43	0	7	20	6	12	33	0	9	29	11	12	49	165
Hourly Total	0	64	86	48	96	198	0	35	99	42	61	176	0	19	84	25	62	128	0	29	129	52	41	210	712
7:00 PM	1	14	19	6	48	40	0	6	23	15	3	44	1	5	28	8	17	42	0	6	29	14	4	49	175
7:15 PM	0	10	17	15	35	42	1	9	13	14	5	37	0	5	20	6	13	31	0	11	26	7	3	44	154
7:30 PM	0	9	12	6	12	27	0	6	27	4	10	37	0	2	18	7	12	27	0	7	22	14	6	43	134
7:45 PM	0	9	11	9	9	29	0	10	13	3	6	26	0	4	18	3	16	25	0	3	17	5	5	25	105
Hourly Total	1	42	59	36	104	138	1	31	76	36	24	144	1	16	84	24	58	125	0	27	94	40	18	161	568
8:00 PM	0	5	12	6	14	23	0	1	15	4	7	20	0	3	18	5	15	26	1	8	21	6	6	36	105
8:15 PM	0	10	11	2	24	23	0	2	10	5	11	17	0	5	12	6	8	23	0	2	18	8	5	28	91
8:30 PM	0	9	6	3	15	18	0	2	7	4	3	13	0	5	9	0	6	14	0	3	8	8	4	19	64
8:45 PM	0	8	6	6	7	20	0	1	9	4	7	14	0	4	4	2	13	10	0	0	16	6	1	22	66
Hourly Total	0	32	35	17	60	84	0	6	41	17	28	64	0	17	43	13	42	73	1	13	63	28	16	105	326
9:00 PM	0	11	8	2	7	21	0	1	5	1	4	7	0	4	10	1	6	15	0	0	9	5	3	14	57
9:15 PM	0	9	4	3	22	16	0	1	8	2	5	11	0	4	7	4	5	15	0	1	14	7	2	22	64
9:30 PM	0	17	5	7	18	29	0	2	12	1	6	15	0	3	13	3	1	19	0	3	13	4	5	20	83
9:45 PM	0	5	12	0	8	17	0	2	3	4	4	9	0	2	10	3	8	15	0	1	6	1	2	8	49
Hourly Total	0	42	29	12	55	83	0	6	28	8	19	42	0	13	40	11	20	64	0	5	42	17	12	64	253
*** BREAK ***	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
4:00 PM	0	5	25	6	7	36	0	5	24	13	9	42	0	5	18	7	5	30	0	3	16	7	6	26	134
4:15 PM	0	8	17	7	36	32	0	3	23	12	14	38	0	10	20	4	11	34	0	1	23	7	4	31	135
4:30 PM	0	19	29	2	7	50	0	5	15	6	3	26	0	3	21	6	3	30	0	8	37	13	5	58	164
4:45 PM	0	9	20	10	13	39	0	9	24	6	11	39	0	9	14	4	5	27	0	4	25	12	10	41	146
Hourly Total	0	41	91	25	63	157	0	22	86	37	37	145	0	27	73	21	24	121	0	16	101	39	25	156	579
5:00 PM	0	14	25	12	26	51	0	10	18	15	14	43	0	3	20	5	9	28	0	9	31	17	5	57	179

5:15 PM	0	7	13	15	20	35	0	3	34	10	7	47	0	8	20	6	9	34	0	8	19	17	2	44	160
5:30 PM	0	15	24	11	47	50	0	11	27	10	14	48	0	10	33	7	13	50	0	11	33	11	5	55	203
5:45 PM	0	18	21	7	85	46	0	17	18	16	25	51	0	8	18	10	18	36	0	15	32	18	10	65	198
Hourly Total	0	54	83	45	178	182	0	41	97	51	60	189	0	29	91	28	49	148	0	43	115	63	22	221	740
6:00 PM	0	24	27	17	26	68	0	12	28	11	19	51	0	9	20	8	30	37	0	13	33	19	5	65	221
6:15 PM	0	18	21	13	52	52	0	11	19	21	21	51	0	8	21	6	29	35	0	13	35	16	7	64	202
6:30 PM	0	11	29	13	33	53	0	15	19	14	10	48	0	9	23	3	27	35	0	12	22	13	12	47	183
6:45 PM	0	9	23	16	46	48	0	14	24	13	17	51	0	15	20	5	48	40	1	10	31	25	8	67	206
Hourly Total	0	62	100	59	157	221	0	52	90	59	67	201	0	41	84	22	134	147	1	48	121	73	32	243	812
7:00 PM	0	16	23	26	72	65	0	15	33	14	23	62	0	7	17	12	29	36	0	4	26	17	31	47	210
7:15 PM	0	15	23	16	48	54	0	7	24	15	18	46	0	5	18	7	41	30	0	8	24	18	24	50	180
7:30 PM	0	15	18	11	25	44	1	8	21	6	10	36	0	5	16	12	25	33	0	9	25	17	8	51	164
7:45 PM	0	13	12	5	20	30	0	9	15	8	20	32	0	5	14	5	31	24	0	11	16	15	12	42	128
Hourly Total	0	59	76	58	165	193	1	39	93	43	71	176	0	22	65	36	126	123	0	32	91	67	75	190	682
8:00 PM	0	14	14	10	33	38	0	5	16	14	3	35	0	6	20	5	14	31	0	7	14	15	11	36	140
8:15 PM	0	10	17	10	38	37	0	8	9	11	14	28	0	4	15	7	7	26	0	7	26	12	11	45	136
8:30 PM	0	12	12	10	16	34	0	6	10	7	7	23	0	3	12	8	16	23	0	5	16	5	5	26	106
8:45 PM	0	7	6	7	25	20	0	2	13	5	10	20	0	5	10	2	28	17	0	4	17	12	13	33	90
Hourly Total	0	43	49	37	112	129	0	21	48	37	34	106	0	18	57	22	65	97	0	23	73	44	40	140	472
9:00 PM	0	13	17	12	10	42	0	5	7	6	17	18	0	5	13	3	18	21	1	3	16	5	11	25	106
9:15 PM	0	11	13	4	24	28	0	2	14	9	9	25	0	4	11	4	34	19	0	4	11	9	6	24	96
9:30 PM	1	7	7	8	24	23	1	3	6	2	7	12	0	4	14	1	22	19	0	5	13	6	10	24	78
9:45 PM	0	17	11	3	24	31	0	2	7	6	20	15	0	5	12	5	32	22	0	6	15	7	20	28	96
Hourly Total	1	48	48	27	82	124	1	12	34	23	53	70	0	18	50	13	106	81	1	18	55	27	47	101	376
*** BREAK ***	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
4:00 PM	0	14	22	8	20	44	1	7	17	7	13	32	0	3	20	4	10	27	0	8	22	9	6	39	142
4:15 PM	0	15	19	10	18	44	0	6	11	13	21	30	0	4	12	2	12	18	0	10	26	11	19	47	139
4:30 PM	0	13	20	5	14	38	0	6	17	12	26	35	0	3	23	6	22	32	1	9	24	8	11	42	147
4:45 PM	0	10	18	12	24	40	0	14	16	10	15	40	0	6	16	6	16	28	0	12	21	14	15	47	155
Hourly Total	0	52	79	35	76	166	1	33	61	42	75	137	0	16	71	18	60	105	1	39	93	42	51	175	583
5:00 PM	0	19	17	14	5	50	0	10	27	13	10	50	0	15	22	8	18	45	0	7	20	19	6	46	191
5:15 PM	0	21	16	16	26	53	0	9	21	14	34	44	0	10	22	10	54	42	0	17	34	17	26	68	207
5:30 PM	0	17	18	17	31	52	0	10	26	20	21	56	0	5	22	8	41	35	0	6	27	14	34	47	190
5:45 PM	0	12	15	18	26	45	0	11	20	18	25	49	0	7	18	12	48	37	0	3	28	13	16	44	175
Hourly Total	0	69	66	65	88	200	0	40	94	65	90	199	0	37	84	38	161	159	0	33	109	63	82	205	763
6:00 PM	0	19	22	17	45	58	0	19	19	11	38	49	0	10	16	7	60	33	0	11	15	21	31	47	187
6:15 PM	0	15	20	17	62	52	0	21	27	13	26	61	0	6	23	7	50	36	0	10	30	23	39	63	212
6:30 PM	0	16	19	11	33	46	0	15	24	13	18	52	0	4	17	21	42	42	0	15	26	13	16	54	194
6:45 PM	0	17	15	16	53	48	1	13	22	14	26	50	0	15	13	11	45	39	0	13	24	22	28	59	196
Hourly Total	0	67	76	61	193	204	1	68	92	51	108	212	0	35	69	46	197	150	0	49	95	79	114	223	789
7:00 PM	0	13	14	14	63	41	0	18	37	11	54	66	0	11	15	6	72	32	0	8	39	26	52	73	212
7:15 PM	0	14	12	14	75	40	0	7	16	11	20	34	0	4	29	8	63	41	0	15	27	26	25	68	183
7:30 PM	0	17	16	12	41	45	0	12	19	8	18	39	0	5	9	10	40	24	1	10	22	16	20	49	157
7:45 PM	0	9	20	13	32	42	0	8	14	9	7	31	0	5	21	5	28	31	0	8	22	13	22	43	147
Hourly Total	0	53	62	53	211	168	0	45	86	39	99	170	0	25	74	29	203	128	1	41	110	81	119	233	699
8:00 PM	0	10	11	7	44	28	0	9	11	2	30	22	0	4	12	5	30	21	0	6	10	12	18	28	99
8:15 PM	0	14	13	10	27	37	0	3	9	7	23	19	0	5	12	4	32	21	1	6	14	10	13	31	108
8:30 PM	0	7	16	12	59	35	1	2	11	7	22	21	1	9	14	6	42	30	0	4	20	9	10	33	119
8:45 PM	0	18	9	8	43	35	0	6	9	6	22	21	0	6	7	3	17	16	1	4	16	9	18	30	102
Hourly Total	0	49	49	37	173	135	1	20	40	22	97	83	1	24	45	18	121	88	2	20	60	40	59	122	428
9:00 PM	0	10	9	10	24	29	0	1	18	6	17	25	0	5	14	5	35	24	0	6	20	9	8	35	113
9:15 PM	0	19	8	2	31	29	1	4	15	4	10	24	0	1	10	9	18	20	0	0	10	8	13	18	91

9:30 PM	0	16	10	8	35	34	0	4	9	7	21	20	0	5	7	2	31	14	0	3	10	6	23	19	87
	0	13	10	7	53	30	0	1	9	4	28	14	2	2	21	3	33	28	0	0	4	4	20	8	80
9:45 PM	0	58	37	27	143	122	1	10	51	21	76	83	2	13	52	19	117	86	0	9	44	27	64	80	371
Hourly Total	2	945	1200	725	2196	2872	7	534	1307	662	1083	2510	4	417	1230	420	1606	2071	8	513	1630	876	877	3027	10480
Grand Total	0.1	32.9	41.8	25.2	-	-	0.3	21.3	52.1	26.4	-	-	0.2	20.1	59.4	20.3	-	-	0.3	16.9	53.8	28.9	-	-	-
Approach %	0.0	9.0	11.5	6.9	-	27.4	0.1	5.1	12.5	6.3	-	24.0	0.0	4.0	11.7	4.0	-	19.8	0.1	4.9	15.6	8.4	-	28.9	-
Total %	2	942	1197	724	-	2865	7	534	1302	658	-	2501	4	414	1228	420	-	2066	8	513	1625	876	-	3022	10454
Lights	100.0	99.7	99.8	99.9	-	99.8	100.0	100.0	99.6	99.4	-	99.6	100.0	99.3	99.8	100.0	-	99.8	100.0	100.0	99.7	100.0	-	99.8	99.8
% Lights	0	0	1	0	-	1	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	-	0	1	
Buses	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	
% Buses	0	2	2	1	-	5	0	0	4	4	-	8	0	3	2	0	-	5	0	0	4	0	-	4	22
Single-Unit Trucks	0.0	0.2	0.2	0.1	-	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.6	-	0.3	0.0	0.7	0.2	0.0	-	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.0	-	0.1	0.2
% Single-Unit Trucks	0	1	0	0	-	1	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	-	0	1	
Articulated Trucks	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	
% Articulated Trucks	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	1	0	-	1	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	1	0	-	1	2
Bicycles on Road	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	-	0.0	0.0
% Bicycles on Road	-	-	-	-	2196	-	-	-	-	-	1083	-	-	-	-	-	1606	-	-	-	-	-	877	-	-
Pedestrians	-	-	-	-	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	100.0	-	-
% Pedestrians	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-



Kenig Lindgren O'Hara Aboona, Inc.
9575 W. Higgins Rd., Suite 400

Rosemont, Illinois, United States 60018
(847)518-9990

Count Name: Campbell Street with Vail Avenue
Site Code:
Start Date: 02/07/2019
Page No: 4

Turning Movement Peak Hour Data (5:15 PM)

Start Time	Campbell Street Eastbound						Campbell Street Westbound						Vail Avenue Northbound						Vail Avenue Southbound					
	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total
5:15 PM	0	13	20	15	46	48	0	11	32	10	8	53	0	8	21	10	3	39	0	4	39	15	15	58
5:30 PM	0	17	24	17	15	58	0	6	27	6	10	39	0	10	20	8	6	38	0	6	32	12	7	50
5:45 PM	0	13	29	11	104	53	0	13	29	15	19	57	0	7	21	5	19	33	0	15	34	16	11	65
6:00 PM	0	18	22	9	35	49	0	12	32	14	7	58	0	7	29	10	17	46	0	10	41	17	3	68
Total	0	61	95	52	200	208	0	42	120	45	44	207	0	32	91	33	45	156	0	35	146	60	36	241
Approach %	0.0	29.3	45.7	25.0	-	-	0.0	20.3	58.0	21.7	-	-	0.0	20.5	58.3	21.2	-	-	0.0	14.5	60.6	24.9	-	-
Total %	0.0	7.5	11.7	6.4	-	25.6	0.0	5.2	14.8	5.5	-	25.5	0.0	3.9	11.2	4.1	-	19.2	0.0	4.3	18.0	7.4	-	29.7
PHF	0.000	0.847	0.819	0.765	-	0.897	0.000	0.808	0.938	0.750	-	0.892	0.000	0.800	0.784	0.825	-	0.848	0.000	0.583	0.890	0.882	-	0.886
Lights	0	60	94	52	-	206	0	42	119	45	-	206	0	32	90	33	-	155	0	35	145	60	-	240
% Lights	-	98.4	98.9	100.0	-	99.0	-	100.0	99.2	100.0	-	99.5	-	100.0	98.9	100.0	-	99.4	-	100.0	99.3	100.0	-	99.6
Buses	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0
% Buses	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0
Single-Unit Trucks	0	0	1	0	-	1	0	0	1	0	-	1	0	0	1	0	-	1	0	0	1	0	-	1
% Single-Unit Trucks	-	0.0	1.1	0.0	-	0.5	-	0.0	0.8	0.0	-	0.5	-	0.0	1.1	0.0	-	0.6	-	0.0	0.7	0.0	-	0.4
Articulated Trucks	0	1	0	0	-	1	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0
% Articulated Trucks	-	1.6	0.0	0.0	-	0.5	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0
Bicycles on Road	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0
% Bicycles on Road	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0
Pedestrians	-	-	-	-	200	-	-	-	-	-	44	-	-	-	-	-	45	-	-	-	-	-	36	-
% Pedestrians	-	-	-	-	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	100.0	-



Kenig Lindgren O'Hara Aboona, Inc.
9575 W. Higgins Rd., Suite 400

Rosemont, Illinois, United States 60018
(847)518-9990

Count Name: Campbell Street with Vail Avenue
Site Code:
Start Date: 02/07/2019
Page No.: 5

Turning Movement Peak Hour Data (5:30 PM)

Start Time	Campbell Street Eastbound						Campbell Street Westbound						Vail Avenue Northbound						Vail Avenue Southbound					
	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total
5:30 PM	0	15	24	11	47	50	0	11	27	10	14	48	0	10	33	7	13	50	0	11	33	11	5	55
5:45 PM	0	18	21	7	85	46	0	17	18	16	25	51	0	8	18	10	18	36	0	15	32	18	10	65
6:00 PM	0	24	27	17	26	68	0	12	28	11	19	51	0	9	20	8	30	37	0	13	33	19	5	65
6:15 PM	0	18	21	13	52	52	0	11	19	21	21	51	0	8	21	6	29	35	0	13	35	16	7	64
Total	0	75	93	48	210	216	0	51	92	58	79	201	0	35	92	31	90	158	0	52	133	64	27	249
Approach %	0.0	34.7	43.1	22.2	-	-	0.0	25.4	45.8	28.9	-	-	0.0	22.2	58.2	19.6	-	-	0.0	20.9	53.4	25.7	-	-
Total %	0.0	9.1	11.3	5.8	-	26.2	0.0	6.2	11.2	7.0	-	24.4	0.0	4.2	11.2	3.8	-	19.2	0.0	6.3	16.1	7.8	-	30.2
PHF	0.000	0.781	0.861	0.706	-	0.794	0.000	0.750	0.821	0.690	-	0.985	0.000	0.875	0.697	0.775	-	0.790	0.000	0.867	0.950	0.842	-	0.958
Lights	0	75	93	48	-	216	0	51	91	58	-	200	0	35	92	31	-	158	0	52	133	64	-	249
% Lights	-	100.0	100.0	100.0	-	100.0	-	100.0	98.9	100.0	-	99.5	-	100.0	100.0	100.0	-	100.0	-	100.0	100.0	100.0	-	100.0
Buses	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0
% Buses	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0
Single-Unit Trucks	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	1	0	-	1	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0
% Single-Unit Trucks	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	1.1	0.0	-	0.5	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0
Articulated Trucks	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0
% Articulated Trucks	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0
Bicycles on Road	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0
% Bicycles on Road	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0
Pedestrians	-	-	-	-	210	-	-	-	-	-	79	-	-	-	-	-	90	-	-	-	-	-	27	-
% Pedestrians	-	-	-	-	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	100.0	-



Kenig Lindgren O'Hara Aboona, Inc.
9575 W. Higgins Rd., Suite 400

Rosemont, Illinois, United States 60018
(847)518-9990

Count Name: Campbell Street with Vail Avenue
Site Code:
Start Date: 02/07/2019
Page No: 6

Turning Movement Peak Hour Data (6:15 PM)

Start Time	Campbell Street Eastbound						Campbell Street Westbound						Vail Avenue Northbound						Vail Avenue Southbound					
	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total
6:15 PM	0	15	20	17	62	52	0	21	27	13	26	61	0	6	23	7	50	36	0	10	30	23	39	63
6:30 PM	0	16	19	11	33	46	0	15	24	13	18	52	0	4	17	21	42	42	0	15	26	13	16	54
6:45 PM	0	17	15	16	53	48	1	13	22	14	26	50	0	15	13	11	45	39	0	13	24	22	28	59
7:00 PM	0	13	14	14	63	41	0	18	37	11	54	66	0	11	15	6	72	32	0	8	39	26	52	73
Total	0	61	68	58	211	187	1	67	110	51	124	229	0	36	68	45	209	149	0	46	119	84	135	249
Approach %	0.0	32.6	36.4	31.0	-	-	0.4	29.3	48.0	22.3	-	-	0.0	24.2	45.6	30.2	-	-	0.0	18.5	47.8	33.7	-	-
Total %	0.0	7.5	8.4	7.1	-	23.0	0.1	8.2	13.5	6.3	-	28.1	0.0	4.4	8.4	5.5	-	18.3	0.0	5.7	14.6	10.3	-	30.6
PHF	0.000	0.897	0.850	0.853	-	0.899	0.250	0.798	0.743	0.911	-	0.867	0.000	0.600	0.739	0.536	-	0.887	0.000	0.767	0.763	0.808	-	0.853
Lights	0	61	68	58	-	187	1	67	110	51	-	229	0	36	68	45	-	149	0	46	119	84	-	249
% Lights	-	100.0	100.0	100.0	-	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	-	100.0	-	100.0	100.0	100.0	-	100.0	-	100.0	100.0	100.0	-	100.0
Buses	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0
% Buses	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0
Single-Unit Trucks	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0
% Single-Unit Trucks	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0
Articulated Trucks	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0
% Articulated Trucks	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0
Bicycles on Road	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0
% Bicycles on Road	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0
Pedestrians	-	-	-	-	211	-	-	-	-	-	124	-	-	-	-	-	-	209	-	-	-	-	135	-
% Pedestrians	-	-	-	-	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	100.0	-	-	-	-	100.0	-



Kenig Lindgren O'Hara Aboona, Inc.
9575 W. Higgins Rd., Suite 400
Rosemont, Illinois, United States 60018
(847)518-9990

Count Name: Sigwalt Street with Highland Avenue
Site Code:
Start Date: 02/07/2019
Page No: 1

Turning Movement Data

Start Time	Sigwalt Street Eastbound					Sigwalt Street Westbound					Highland Avenue Northbound					Highland Avenue Southbound					App. Total	Int. Total			
	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds					
4:00 PM	0	1	22	2	0	25	0	1	38	3	3	42	0	0	2	2	1	4	0	4	3	3	0	10	81
4:15 PM	0	1	26	1	0	28	0	4	38	4	0	46	0	2	4	1	0	7	0	5	1	4	0	10	91
4:30 PM	0	3	23	1	0	27	0	1	43	5	0	49	0	3	4	2	0	9	0	7	4	5	0	16	101
4:45 PM	0	3	25	1	0	29	0	1	37	5	3	43	0	3	2	4	0	9	0	1	3	0	1	4	85
Hourly Total	0	8	96	5	0	109	0	7	156	17	6	180	0	8	12	9	1	29	0	17	11	12	1	40	358
5:00 PM	0	1	20	0	2	21	0	1	36	6	1	43	0	1	8	5	0	14	0	8	4	8	1	20	98
5:15 PM	0	2	23	1	1	26	0	5	40	12	0	57	0	2	7	7	0	16	0	8	5	4	1	17	116
5:30 PM	0	1	33	3	0	37	0	3	41	9	0	53	0	1	4	2	0	7	0	7	11	7	0	25	122
5:45 PM	0	0	34	4	1	38	0	3	31	10	1	44	0	1	4	6	0	11	0	9	5	6	1	20	113
Hourly Total	0	4	110	8	4	122	0	12	148	37	2	197	0	5	23	20	0	48	0	32	25	25	3	82	449
6:00 PM	1	1	28	1	0	31	0	2	38	12	3	52	0	0	6	4	0	10	0	20	13	18	0	51	144
6:15 PM	0	0	16	0	0	16	0	2	25	9	0	36	0	0	2	2	0	4	0	7	9	5	0	21	77
6:30 PM	0	0	13	0	0	13	0	2	20	10	2	32	0	1	5	4	0	10	0	11	6	13	0	30	85
6:45 PM	0	1	15	1	1	17	0	1	29	14	0	44	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	7	3	7	0	17	80
Hourly Total	1	2	72	2	1	77	0	7	112	45	5	164	0	1	13	12	0	26	0	45	31	43	0	119	386
7:00 PM	0	3	17	0	1	20	0	3	28	9	4	40	0	2	2	2	0	6	0	12	8	4	0	24	90
7:15 PM	0	1	14	1	2	16	0	3	32	9	0	44	0	0	2	1	0	3	0	7	1	4	1	12	75
7:30 PM	0	2	14	1	1	17	0	0	19	4	1	23	0	1	3	2	0	6	0	11	0	3	2	14	60
7:45 PM	0	2	15	1	0	18	0	3	17	7	0	27	0	0	2	3	0	5	0	7	1	3	0	11	61
Hourly Total	0	8	60	3	4	71	0	9	96	29	5	134	0	3	9	8	0	20	0	37	10	14	3	61	286
8:00 PM	0	1	14	0	0	15	0	3	19	2	0	24	1	0	3	1	0	5	0	6	3	5	0	14	58
8:15 PM	0	0	11	0	0	11	0	2	35	3	0	40	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	14	2	4	0	20	73
8:30 PM	0	1	5	0	0	6	0	0	10	1	0	11	0	0	2	1	0	3	0	1	1	0	0	2	22
8:45 PM	0	0	6	1	0	7	0	1	8	2	0	11	0	1	1	0	0	2	0	5	1	1	0	7	27
Hourly Total	0	2	36	1	0	39	0	6	72	8	0	86	1	1	8	2	0	12	0	26	7	10	0	43	180
9:00 PM	0	0	5	0	0	5	0	0	13	4	2	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	1	2	0	10	32
9:15 PM	0	0	14	0	0	14	0	2	17	0	0	19	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	4	3	1	0	8	42
9:30 PM	0	1	3	1	0	5	1	1	9	5	0	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	1	1	0	10	31
9:45 PM	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	6	4	1	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	3	0	8	19
Hourly Total	0	1	23	1	0	25	1	3	45	13	3	62	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	22	7	7	0	36	124
*** BREAK ***	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
4:00 PM	0	0	23	0	0	23	0	0	36	6	0	42	0	1	0	5	0	6	0	7	0	2	0	9	80
4:15 PM	0	2	27	1	0	30	0	5	29	7	0	41	0	0	4	3	0	7	0	6	3	1	1	10	88
4:30 PM	0	1	38	0	0	39	0	5	43	10	2	58	0	1	3	2	0	6	0	9	6	8	0	23	126
4:45 PM	0	3	23	0	0	26	0	3	48	11	0	62	0	0	2	4	0	6	0	3	0	4	0	7	101
Hourly Total	0	6	111	1	0	118	0	13	156	34	2	203	0	2	9	14	0	25	0	25	9	15	1	49	395
5:00 PM	0	4	25	0	0	29	0	6	42	3	0	51	0	2	2	4	0	8	0	7	3	6	1	16	104

5:15 PM	0	3	27	2	0	32	0	1	37	11	1	49	0	1	4	2	0	7	0	11	2	4	0	17	105
5:30 PM	0	7	33	1	1	41	0	2	42	14	0	58	0	1	3	1	0	5	0	19	5	14	0	38	142
5:45 PM	0	3	28	1	0	32	0	4	42	14	0	60	0	0	7	1	0	8	0	8	4	2	0	14	114
Hourly Total	0	17	113	4	1	134	0	13	163	42	1	218	0	4	16	8	0	28	0	45	14	26	1	85	465
6:00 PM	0	4	27	1	0	32	0	1	38	10	0	49	0	2	3	2	0	7	0	14	12	10	0	36	124
6:15 PM	0	0	15	0	0	15	0	2	40	14	2	56	0	2	0	5	0	7	0	18	3	1	0	22	100
6:30 PM	0	0	17	3	0	20	0	3	30	8	1	41	0	2	0	4	0	6	0	6	4	4	0	14	81
6:45 PM	0	1	15	0	0	16	0	4	29	6	1	39	0	3	5	1	1	9	0	2	2	3	0	7	71
Hourly Total	0	5	74	4	0	83	0	10	137	38	4	185	0	9	8	12	1	29	0	40	21	18	0	79	376
7:00 PM	0	1	22	0	0	23	0	4	22	9	0	35	0	1	5	3	0	9	0	18	2	6	0	26	93
7:15 PM	0	3	16	0	0	19	0	3	13	6	3	22	0	2	2	3	0	7	0	16	4	4	0	24	72
7:30 PM	0	2	11	1	0	14	0	0	15	6	1	21	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	8	3	0	0	11	48
7:45 PM	0	0	4	1	0	5	0	1	21	3	0	25	0	0	2	0	0	2	1	4	1	6	0	12	44
Hourly Total	0	6	53	2	0	61	0	8	71	24	4	103	0	3	11	6	0	20	1	46	10	16	0	73	257
8:00 PM	0	0	16	0	0	16	0	0	25	9	0	34	0	1	4	1	0	6	0	9	2	0	0	11	67
8:15 PM	0	0	8	1	0	9	0	2	11	3	1	16	0	4	0	2	0	2	0	4	2	3	0	9	36
8:30 PM	0	0	6	0	0	6	0	0	19	13	0	32	0	0	0	3	0	3	0	8	1	1	0	10	51
8:45 PM	0	0	11	0	0	11	1	0	18	4	0	23	0	1	1	1	0	3	0	5	3	0	0	8	45
Hourly Total	0	0	41	1	0	42	1	2	73	29	1	105	0	2	5	7	0	14	0	26	8	4	0	38	199
9:00 PM	0	2	2	0	0	4	0	1	15	7	1	23	0	1	4	1	0	6	0	17	2	3	2	22	55
9:15 PM	0	2	5	1	0	8	0	2	16	4	0	22	0	1	1	1	0	3	0	10	0	3	0	13	46
9:30 PM	0	0	9	1	0	10	0	0	11	3	0	14	0	0	3	0	0	3	0	5	1	2	0	8	35
9:45 PM	0	1	3	0	0	4	0	1	7	2	0	10	0	1	0	2	0	3	0	9	1	3	0	13	30
Hourly Total	0	5	19	2	0	26	0	4	49	16	1	69	0	3	8	4	0	15	0	41	4	11	2	56	166
*** BREAK ***																									
4:00 PM	0	1	11	0	1	12	0	3	28	6	1	37	0	0	3	1	0	4	0	5	1	2	2	8	61
4:15 PM	0	1	14	0	0	15	0	0	30	9	0	39	0	0	5	5	3	10	0	9	3	2	0	14	78
4:30 PM	0	0	9	1	1	10	0	2	20	4	0	26	0	0	3	1	0	4	0	13	1	2	1	16	56
4:45 PM	0	0	19	3	2	22	0	0	31	3	0	34	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	5	1	0	1	6	63
Hourly Total	0	2	53	4	4	59	0	5	109	22	1	136	0	0	12	7	4	19	0	32	6	6	4	44	258
5:00 PM	0	2	22	2	2	26	1	2	30	4	2	37	0	0	4	3	0	7	0	17	1	1	0	19	89
5:15 PM	0	3	17	0	0	20	0	2	24	6	0	32	0	0	3	4	0	7	0	9	0	5	0	14	73
5:30 PM	0	1	14	0	0	15	0	2	21	10	1	33	0	0	2	1	0	3	0	22	3	5	0	30	81
5:45 PM	0	1	19	1	0	21	1	0	16	8	1	25	0	0	1	1	0	2	0	9	2	3	0	14	62
Hourly Total	0	7	72	3	2	82	2	6	91	28	4	127	0	0	10	9	0	19	0	57	6	14	0	77	305
6:00 PM	0	7	16	0	0	23	0	1	23	11	1	35	0	0	2	6	0	8	0	6	1	1	0	8	74
6:15 PM	0	3	20	0	0	23	0	2	26	7	0	35	0	1	2	3	0	6	1	17	1	1	0	20	84
6:30 PM	0	4	18	0	0	22	0	2	14	14	2	30	0	0	0	4	0	4	0	16	0	7	0	23	79
6:45 PM	0	2	17	0	0	19	0	2	22	12	0	36	0	2	2	2	0	6	0	14	1	3	0	18	79
Hourly Total	0	16	71	0	0	87	0	7	85	44	3	136	0	3	6	15	0	24	1	53	3	12	0	69	316
7:00 PM	0	2	20	1	0	23	0	6	19	8	2	33	0	1	3	3	0	7	0	18	2	3	1	23	86
7:15 PM	0	3	25	0	0	28	0	2	28	7	1	37	0	0	2	5	0	7	0	13	3	8	1	24	96
7:30 PM	0	1	23	1	0	25	0	3	11	5	2	19	0	0	2	3	0	5	0	14	1	2	0	17	66
7:45 PM	0	1	3	1	0	5	0	0	19	5	2	24	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	10	1	4	0	15	45
Hourly Total	0	7	71	3	0	81	0	11	77	25	7	113	0	1	8	11	0	20	0	55	7	17	2	79	293
8:00 PM	0	0	4	0	0	4	0	2	9	3	1	14	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	8	1	2	0	11	31
8:15 PM	0	0	13	1	0	14	2	2	12	2	0	18	0	0	2	1	0	3	0	7	0	2	0	9	44
8:30 PM	0	2	8	1	2	11	0	1	12	3	0	16	0	0	0	3	0	3	0	15	0	2	1	17	47
8:45 PM	0	0	2	1	0	3	0	0	13	4	0	17	0	0	3	0	0	3	0	7	1	3	0	11	34
Hourly Total	0	2	27	3	2	32	2	5	46	12	1	65	0	0	7	4	0	11	0	37	2	9	1	48	156
9:00 PM	0	2	7	1	0	10	0	1	8	2	1	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	2	2	0	13	34
9:15 PM	0	0	3	0	0	3	0	1	13	2	0	16	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	14	1	1	1	16	37

9:30 PM	0	2	4	0	0	6	0	0	0	10	5	2	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4	1	2	0	7	30
	0	0	8	1	1	9	0	1	14	1	0	16	0	0	1	1	1	1	2	0	9	0	2	0	11	38
9:45 PM	0	4	22	2	1	28	0	3	45	10	3	58	0	0	1	5	1	6	0	36	4	7	1	47	139	
Hourly Total	1	102	1124	49	19	1276	6	131	1731	473	53	2341	1	45	167	153	7	366	2	672	185	266	19	1125	5108	
Grand Total	0.1	8.0	88.1	3.8	-	-	0.3	5.6	73.9	20.2	-	-	0.3	12.3	45.6	41.8	-	-	0.2	59.7	16.4	23.6	-	-	-	
Approach %	0.0	2.0	22.0	1.0	-	25.0	0.1	2.6	33.9	9.3	-	45.8	0.0	0.9	3.3	3.0	-	7.2	0.0	13.2	3.6	5.2	-	22.0	-	
Total %	1	102	1120	48	-	1271	6	131	1722	473	-	2332	1	44	166	153	-	364	2	671	182	266	-	1121	5088	
Lights	100.0	100.0	99.6	98.0	-	99.6	100.0	100.0	99.5	100.0	-	99.6	100.0	97.8	99.4	100.0	-	99.5	100.0	99.9	98.4	100.0	-	99.6	99.6	
% Lights	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	2	0	-	2	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	2	
Buses	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	-	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	
% Buses	0	0	4	1	-	5	0	0	6	0	-	6	0	1	0	0	-	1	0	1	1	0	-	2	14	
Single-Unit Trucks	0.0	0.0	0.4	2.0	-	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.0	-	0.3	0.0	2.2	0.0	0.0	-	0.3	0.0	0.1	0.5	0.0	-	0.2	0.3	
% Single-Unit Trucks	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	
Articulated Trucks	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	
% Articulated Trucks	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	1	0	-	1	0	0	1	0	-	1	0	0	2	0	-	2	4	
Bicycles on Road	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6	0.0	-	0.3	0.0	0.0	1.1	0.0	-	0.2	0.1	
% Bicycles on Road	-	-	-	-	19	-	-	-	-	-	53	-	-	-	-	-	7	-	-	-	-	-	19	-	-	
Pedestrians	-	-	-	-	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	100.0	-	
% Pedestrians	-	-	-	-	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	100.0	-	



Kenig Lindgren O'Hara Aboona, Inc.
9575 W. Higgins Rd., Suite 400
Rosemont, Illinois, United States 60018
(847)518-9990

Count Name: Sigwalt Street with Highland Avenue
Site Code:
Start Date: 02/07/2019
Page No: 4

Turning Movement Peak Hour Data (5:15 PM)

Start Time	Sigwalt Street Eastbound						Sigwalt Street Westbound						Highland Avenue Northbound						Highland Avenue Southbound					
	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total
5:15 PM	0	2	23	1	1	26	0	5	40	12	0	57	0	2	7	7	0	16	0	8	5	4	1	17
5:30 PM	0	1	33	3	0	37	0	3	41	9	0	53	0	1	4	2	0	7	0	7	11	7	0	25
5:45 PM	0	0	34	4	1	38	0	3	31	10	1	44	0	1	4	6	0	11	0	9	5	6	1	20
6:00 PM	1	1	28	1	0	31	0	2	38	12	3	52	0	0	6	4	0	10	0	20	13	18	0	51
Total	1	4	118	9	2	132	0	13	150	43	4	208	0	4	21	19	0	44	0	44	34	35	2	113
Approach %	0.8	3.0	89.4	6.8	-	-	0.0	6.3	72.8	20.9	-	-	0.0	9.1	47.7	43.2	-	-	0.0	38.9	30.1	31.0	-	-
Total %	0.2	0.8	23.8	1.8	-	26.7	0.0	2.6	30.3	8.7	-	41.6	0.0	0.8	4.2	3.8	-	8.9	0.0	8.9	6.9	7.1	-	22.8
PHF	0.250	0.500	0.868	0.563	-	0.868	0.000	0.650	0.915	0.896	-	0.904	0.000	0.500	0.750	0.679	-	0.688	0.000	0.550	0.654	0.486	-	0.554
Lights	1	4	118	9	-	132	0	13	149	43	-	205	0	3	21	19	-	43	0	44	33	35	-	112
% Lights	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	-	100.0	-	100.0	99.3	100.0	-	99.5	-	75.0	100.0	100.0	-	97.7	-	100.0	97.1	100.0	-	99.1
Buses	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0
% Buses	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0
Single-Unit Trucks	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	1	0	-	1	0	1	0	0	-	1	0	0	0	0	-	0
% Single-Unit Trucks	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.7	0.0	-	0.5	-	25.0	0.0	0.0	-	2.3	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0
Articulated Trucks	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0
% Articulated Trucks	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0
Bicycles on Road	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	1	0	-	1
% Bicycles on Road	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	2.9	0.0	-	0.9
Pedestrians	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	2	-
% Pedestrians	-	-	-	-	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100.0	-



Kenig Lindgren O'Hara Aboona, Inc.
9575 W. Higgins Rd., Suite 400
Rosemont, Illinois, United States 60018
(847)518-9990

Count Name: Sigwalt Street with Highland Avenue
Site Code:
Start Date: 02/07/2019
Page No.: 5

Turning Movement Peak Hour Data (5:15 PM)

Start Time	Sigwalt Street Eastbound						Sigwalt Street Westbound						Highland Avenue Northbound						Highland Avenue Southbound					
	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total
5:15 PM	0	3	27	2	0	32	0	1	37	11	1	49	0	1	4	2	0	7	0	11	2	4	0	17
5:30 PM	0	7	33	1	1	41	0	2	42	14	0	58	0	1	3	1	0	5	0	19	5	14	0	38
5:45 PM	0	3	28	1	0	32	0	4	42	14	0	60	0	0	7	1	0	8	0	8	4	2	0	14
6:00 PM	0	4	27	1	0	32	0	1	38	10	0	49	0	2	3	2	0	7	0	14	12	10	0	36
Total	0	17	115	5	1	137	0	8	159	49	1	216	0	4	17	6	0	27	0	52	23	30	0	105
Approach %	0.0	12.4	83.9	3.6	-	-	0.0	3.7	73.6	22.7	-	-	0.0	14.8	63.0	22.2	-	-	0.0	49.5	21.9	28.6	-	-
Total %	0.0	3.5	23.7	1.0	-	28.2	0.0	1.6	32.8	10.1	-	44.5	0.0	0.8	3.5	1.2	-	5.6	0.0	10.7	4.7	6.2	-	21.6
PHF	0.000	0.607	0.871	0.625	-	0.835	0.000	0.500	0.946	0.875	-	0.900	0.000	0.500	0.607	0.750	-	0.844	0.000	0.684	0.479	0.536	-	0.691
Lights	0	17	115	5	-	137	0	8	159	49	-	216	0	4	17	6	-	27	0	52	22	30	-	104
% Lights	-	100.0	100.0	100.0	-	100.0	-	100.0	100.0	100.0	-	100.0	-	100.0	100.0	100.0	-	100.0	-	100.0	95.7	100.0	-	99.0
Buses	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0
% Buses	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0
Single-Unit Trucks	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	1	0	-	1
% Single-Unit Trucks	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	4.3	0.0	-	1.0
Articulated Trucks	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0
% Articulated Trucks	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0
Bicycles on Road	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0
% Bicycles on Road	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0
Pedestrians	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	0	-
% Pedestrians	-	-	-	-	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-



Kenig Lindgren O'Hara Aboona, Inc.
9575 W. Higgins Rd., Suite 400
Rosemont, Illinois, United States 60018
(847)518-9990

Count Name: Sigwalt Street with Highland Avenue
Site Code:
Start Date: 02/07/2019
Page No.: 6

Turning Movement Peak Hour Data (6:30 PM)

Start Time	Sigwalt Street Eastbound						Sigwalt Street Westbound						Highland Avenue Northbound						Highland Avenue Southbound						App. Total	Int. Total
	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	U-Turn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total		
6:30 PM	0	4	18	0	0	22	0	2	14	14	2	30	0	0	0	4	0	4	0	16	0	7	0	23	79	
6:45 PM	0	2	17	0	0	19	0	2	22	12	0	36	0	2	2	2	0	6	0	14	1	3	0	18	79	
7:00 PM	0	2	20	1	0	23	0	6	19	8	2	33	0	1	3	3	0	7	0	18	2	3	1	23	86	
7:15 PM	0	3	25	0	0	28	0	2	28	7	1	37	0	0	2	5	0	7	0	13	3	8	1	24	96	
Total	0	11	80	1	0	92	0	12	83	41	5	136	0	3	7	14	0	24	0	61	6	21	2	88	340	
Approach %	0.0	12.0	87.0	1.1	-	-	0.0	8.8	61.0	30.1	-	-	0.0	12.5	29.2	58.3	-	-	0.0	69.3	6.8	23.9	-	-	-	
Total %	0.0	3.2	23.5	0.3	-	27.1	0.0	3.5	24.4	12.1	-	40.0	0.0	0.9	2.1	4.1	-	7.1	0.0	17.9	1.8	6.2	-	25.9	-	
PHF	0.000	0.688	0.800	0.250	-	0.821	0.000	0.500	0.741	0.732	-	0.919	0.000	0.375	0.583	0.700	-	0.857	0.000	0.847	0.500	0.656	-	0.917	0.885	
Lights	0	11	79	1	-	91	0	12	83	41	-	136	0	3	7	14	-	24	0	61	6	21	-	88	339	
% Lights	-	100.0	98.8	100.0	-	98.9	-	100.0	100.0	100.0	-	100.0	-	100.0	100.0	100.0	-	100.0	-	100.0	100.0	100.0	-	100.0	99.7	
Buses	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	
% Buses	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	
Single-Unit Trucks	0	0	1	0	-	1	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	1	
% Single-Unit Trucks	-	0.0	1.3	0.0	-	1.1	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.3	
Articulated Trucks	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	
% Articulated Trucks	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	
Bicycles on Road	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	
% Bicycles on Road	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	
Pedestrians	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	5	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	
% Pedestrians	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100.0	-	-	

Table A

Thursday, February 7, 2019

Time	Campbell/ Chestnut	Campbell/ Highland	Campbell/ Vail	Sigwalt/ Highland	Total
4:00 PM	342	338	554	358	1592
5:00 PM	471	502	773	449	2195
6:00 PM	361	439	712	386	1898
7:00 PM	244	310	568	286	1408
8:00 PM	161	187	326	180	854
9:00 PM	130	178	253	124	685

Table B

Friday, February 8, 2019

Time	Campbell/ Chestnut	Campbell/ Highland	Campbell/ Vail	Sigwalt/ Highland	Total
4:00 PM	355	366	579	395	1695
5:00 PM	419	451	740	465	2075
6:00 PM	394	469	812	376	2051
7:00 PM	316	430	682	257	1685
8:00 PM	179	263	472	199	1113
9:00 PM	163	227	376	166	932

Table C

Saturday, February 9, 2019

Time	Campbell/ Chestnut	Campbell/ Highland	Campbell/ Vail	Sigwalt/ Highland	Total
4:00 PM	277	329	583	258	1447
5:00 PM	382	486	763	305	1936
6:00 PM	337	465	789	316	1907
7:00 PM	316	422	699	293	1730
8:00 PM	154	287	428	156	1025
9:00 PM	163	228	371	139	901

ITE/ULI Vehicle Trip/Parking Rates

Multifamily Housing (Low-Rise) (220)


Vehicle Trip Ends vs: Dwelling Units
On a: Weekday

Setting/Location: General Urban/Suburban
Number of Studies: 29
Avg. Num. of Dwelling Units: 168
Directional Distribution: 50% entering, 50% exiting

Vehicle Trip Generation per Dwelling Unit

Average Rate	Range of Rates	Standard Deviation
7.32	4.45 - 10.97	1.31

Data Plot and Equation



Multifamily Housing (Low-Rise) (220)

Vehicle Trip Ends vs: Dwelling Units

On a: Weekday,

Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic,

One Hour Between 7 and 9 a.m.

Setting/Location: General Urban/Suburban

Number of Studies: 42

Avg. Num. of Dwelling Units: 199

Directional Distribution: 23% entering, 77% exiting

Vehicle Trip Generation per Dwelling Unit

Average Rate

Range of Rates


Standard Deviation

0.46

0.18 - 0.74

0.12

Data Plot and Equation



Multifamily Housing (Low-Rise) (220)

Vehicle Trip Ends vs: Dwelling Units

On a: Weekday,

Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic,

One Hour Between 4 and 6 p.m.

Setting/Location: General Urban/Suburban

Number of Studies: 50

Avg. Num. of Dwelling Units: 187

Directional Distribution: 63% entering, 37% exiting

Vehicle Trip Generation per Dwelling Unit

Average Rate

Range of Rates


Standard Deviation

0.56

0.18 - 1.25

0.16

Data Plot and Equation



Shopping Center (820)


Vehicle Trip Ends vs: 1000 Sq. Ft. GLA
On a: Weekday

Setting/Location: General Urban/Suburban
Number of Studies: 147
1000 Sq. Ft. GLA: 453
Directional Distribution: 50% entering, 50% exiting

Vehicle Trip Generation per 1000 Sq. Ft. GLA

Average Rate	Range of Rates	Standard Deviation
37.75	7.42 - 207.98	16.41

Data Plot and Equation




Shopping Center (820)

Vehicle Trip Ends vs: 1000 Sq. Ft. GLA
 On a: Weekday,
 Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic,
 One Hour Between 7 and 9 a.m.
 Setting/Location: General Urban/Suburban
 Number of Studies: 84
 1000 Sq. Ft. GLA: 351
 Directional Distribution: 62% entering, 38% exiting

Vehicle Trip Generation per 1000 Sq. Ft. GLA

Average Rate	Range of Rates	Standard Deviation
0.94	0.18 - 23.74	0.87

Data Plot and Equation




Shopping Center (820)

Vehicle Trip Ends vs: 1000 Sq. Ft. GLA
 On a: Weekday,
 Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic,
 One Hour Between 4 and 6 p.m.
 Setting/Location: General Urban/Suburban
 Number of Studies: 261
 1000 Sq. Ft. GLA: 327
 Directional Distribution: 48% entering, 52% exiting

Vehicle Trip Generation per 1000 Sq. Ft. GLA

Average Rate	Range of Rates	Standard Deviation
3.81	0.74 - 18.69	2.04

Data Plot and Equation



General Office Building (710)


Vehicle Trip Ends vs: 1000 Sq. Ft. GFA
On a: Weekday

Setting/Location: General Urban/Suburban
Number of Studies: 66
1000 Sq. Ft. GFA: 171
Directional Distribution: 50% entering, 50% exiting

Vehicle Trip Generation per 1000 Sq. Ft. GFA

Average Rate	Range of Rates	Standard Deviation
9.74	2.71 - 27.56	5.15

Data Plot and Equation




General Office Building (710)

Vehicle Trip Ends vs: 1000 Sq. Ft. GFA
 On a: Weekday,
 Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic,
 One Hour Between 7 and 9 a.m.
 Setting/Location: General Urban/Suburban
 Number of Studies: 35
 1000 Sq. Ft. GFA: 117
 Directional Distribution: 86% entering, 14% exiting

Vehicle Trip Generation per 1000 Sq. Ft. GFA

Average Rate	Range of Rates	Standard Deviation
1.16	0.37 - 4.23	0.47

Data Plot and Equation




General Office Building (710)

Vehicle Trip Ends vs: 1000 Sq. Ft. GFA
 On a: Weekday,
 Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic,
 One Hour Between 4 and 6 p.m.
 Setting/Location: General Urban/Suburban
 Number of Studies: 32
 1000 Sq. Ft. GFA: 114
 Directional Distribution: 16% entering, 84% exiting

Vehicle Trip Generation per 1000 Sq. Ft. GFA

Average Rate	Range of Rates	Standard Deviation
1.15	0.47 - 3.23	0.42

Data Plot and Equation



Quality Restaurant (931)


Vehicle Trip Ends vs: 1000 Sq. Ft. GFA
On a: Weekday

Setting/Location: General Urban/Suburban
Number of Studies: 10
1000 Sq. Ft. GFA: 9
Directional Distribution: 50% entering, 50% exiting

Vehicle Trip Generation per 1000 Sq. Ft. GFA

Average Rate	Range of Rates	Standard Deviation
83.84	33.45 - 139.93	40.01

Data Plot and Equation




Quality Restaurant (931)

Vehicle Trip Ends vs: 1000 Sq. Ft. GFA
 On a: Weekday,
 Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic,
 One Hour Between 7 and 9 a.m.
 Setting/Location: General Urban/Suburban
 Number of Studies: 7
 1000 Sq. Ft. GFA: 10
 Directional Distribution: Not Available

Vehicle Trip Generation per 1000 Sq. Ft. GFA

Average Rate	Range of Rates	Standard Deviation
0.73	0.25 - 1.60	0.42

Data Plot and Equation




Quality Restaurant (931)

Vehicle Trip Ends vs: 1000 Sq. Ft. GFA
 On a: Weekday,
 Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic,
 One Hour Between 4 and 6 p.m.
 Setting/Location: General Urban/Suburban
 Number of Studies: 19
 1000 Sq. Ft. GFA: 9
 Directional Distribution: 67% entering, 33% exiting

Vehicle Trip Generation per 1000 Sq. Ft. GFA

Average Rate	Range of Rates	Standard Deviation
7.80	2.62 - 18.68	4.49

Data Plot and Equation




Land Use: 221

Low/Mid-Rise Apartment

Average Peak Period Parking Demand vs. Dwelling Units
On a: Weekday
Location: Urban

Statistic	Peak Period Demand
Peak Period	10:00 p.m.-5:00 a.m.
Number of Study Sites	40
Average Size of Study Sites	70 dwelling units
Average Peak Period Parking Demand	1.20 vehicles per dwelling unit
Standard Deviation	0.42
Coefficient of Variation	35%
95% Confidence Interval	1.07-1.33 vehicles per dwelling unit
Range	0.66-2.50 vehicles per dwelling unit
85th Percentile	1.61 vehicles per dwelling unit
33rd Percentile	0.93 vehicles per dwelling unit




Land Use: 221

Low/Mid-Rise Apartment

Average Peak Period Parking Demand vs. Dwelling Units
On a: Saturday
Location: Urban

Statistic	Peak Period Demand
Peak Period	No clear peak period emerged from the data; likely to fall between 10:00 p.m. and 6:00 a.m.
Number of Study Sites	8
Average Size of Study Sites	147 dwelling units
Average Peak Period Parking Demand	1.03 vehicles per dwelling unit
Standard Deviation	0.19
Coefficient of Variation	19%
Range	0.80–1.43 vehicles per dwelling unit
85th Percentile	1.14 vehicles per dwelling unit
33rd Percentile	0.93 vehicles per dwelling unit




◆ Actual Data Points

— Fitted Curve/Average Rate

Land Use: 701 Office Building

Average Peak Period Parking Demand vs. 1,000 sq. ft. GFA
On a: Weekday
Location: Urban


Statistic	Peak Period Demand
Peak Period	9:00 a.m.–5:00 p.m.
Number of Study Sites	14
Average Size of Study Sites	370,000 sq. ft. GFA
Average Peak Period Parking Demand	2.47 vehicles per 1,000 sq. ft. GFA
Standard Deviation	0.62
Coefficient of Variation	25%
Range	1.46–3.43 vehicles per 1,000 sq. ft. GFA
85th Percentile	2.98 vehicles per 1,000 sq. ft. GFA
33rd Percentile	2.24 vehicles per 1,000 sq. ft. GFA



Land Use: 820 Shopping Center

Average Peak Period Parking Demand vs. 1,000 sq. ft. GLA On a: Non-Friday Weekday (Non-December)

Statistic	Peak Period Demand
Peak Period	11:00–3:00 p.m.; 6:00–7:00 p.m.
Number of Study Sites	24
Average Size of Study Sites	357,700 sq. ft. GLA
Average Peak Period Parking Demand	2.55 vehicles per 1,000 sq. ft. GLA
Standard Deviation	0.93
Coefficient of Variation	37%
Range	1.33–5.58 vehicles per 1,000 sq. ft. GLA
85th Percentile	3.16 vehicles per 1,000 sq. ft. GLA
33rd Percentile	2.20 vehicles per 1,000 sq. ft. GLA



◆ Actual Data Points


— Fitted Curve

---- Average Rate

Land Use: 820 Shopping Center

Average Peak Period Parking Demand vs. 1,000 sq. ft. GLA On a: Saturday (Non-December)

Statistic	Peak Period Demand
Peak Period	1:00–2:00 p.m.
Number of Study Sites	26
Average Size of Study Sites	458,000 sq. ft. GLA
Average Peak Period Parking Demand	2.87 vehicles per 1,000 sq. ft. GLA
Standard Deviation	0.70
Coefficient of Variation	24%
95% Confidence Interval	2.60–3.14 vehicles per 1,000 sq. ft. GLA
Range	1.73–4.82 vehicles per 1,000 sq. ft. GLA
85th Percentile	3.40 vehicles per 1,000 sq. ft. GLA
33rd Percentile	2.46 vehicles per 1,000 sq. ft. GLA



◆ Actual Data Points — Fitted Curve - - - Average Rate

Land Use¹ in Second Edition
Office (701) 25-0000 sq. ft.
Office (701) 25-0000

Land Use ¹ in Second Edition	Land Use in First Edition	Comment
Office (701) <25,000 sq. ft.	Single category: Office	Per Parking Generation separation is appropriate.
Office (701) 25,000 to 100,000 sq. ft.		
Office (701) 100,000 to 500,000 sq. ft.		
Office (701) >500,000 sq. ft.		
Data Processing Center		
Medical/Dental Office (720)		
Bank with Drive-in (92)		
Retail		
Community Center <400,000 sq. ft. (820)	Retail (400,000 sq. ft.)	
Regional Center 400,000 to 600,000 sq. ft. (820)	Retail (600,000 sq. ft.) ²	n/a
Super Regional Center >600,000 sq. ft. (820)		
Fine/Casual Dining (Quality Restaurant, 931; High Turnover with Bar, 932)	Single category: Restaurant	Unpublished study by team member and Parking Generation indicated separation is appropriate.
Family Restaurant (High Turnover with No Bar, 932)		
Fast Food (ITE East Food, 933)	Same	
Cineplex (444) (510 screens)	Single category: Residential	First-edition ratio was applicable for 15 screens. Per Parking Generation separation is appropriate. Specific time of day and adjustment factors are provided for suburban and transit (CBD oriented) locations. Per published references, separation is appropriate.
Residential, Rented (221, 222, 224)	Same	
Residential, Owned (230)	Single category: Residential	
Leisure Hotel (330)—Rooms		
Business Hotel (312)—Rooms		
Restaurant/Lounge	Guest Rooms	
Conference Center/Banquet (20 to 50 sq. ft./room)	Restaurant/Lounge	
Convention (50 sq. ft./room)	Conference Rooms	
Convention Center (455)	Convention Area	
Health Club (492)	Not covered	
Performing Arts Center (441)	Not covered	Common in shared parking situations, especially in central business districts.
Active Entertainment (400 series)	Not covered	Common in shared parking situations.
	Not covered	Common in shared parking situations.
Nightclub		Significant trend in retail development due to wide variation in specific tenants; default values for parking ratios are not provided.
Arena	Not covered	Significant trend in retail development.
Baseball Stadium	Not covered	Common in shared parking situations.
Football Stadium	Not covered	Common in shared parking situations.
	Not covered	Common in shared parking situations.

Notes

¹The ITE Parking Generation land use code is provided in parentheses.

²The first of the first edition of *Shared Parking* recommended that, between 400,000 and 600,000 sq. ft., the ratio should be linearly interpolated from 4.0 to 5.0 spaces per thousand sq. ft., which was consistent with the then-current ULI/ICSC publication on *Parking Requirements for Shopping Centers*. The table strived to reflect the parking ratios, however, identified retail as noted and thus was not completely clear regarding the ratio to be used between 400,000 and 600,000 sq. ft.

0 Shared parking

Source	Summary of Recommended Base Parking Ratios (Spaces per Unit Land Use)	
	Weekday	Weekend
Land Use		

Visitor	Employees	Visitor	Employees
Community Shopping Center (<400,000 sq. ft.)	2.9	0.7	3.2
Regional Shopping Center (400,000 to 600,000 sq. ft.)			0.8
Sliding scale between 400,000 and 600,000 sq. ft.			1
Super Regional Shopping Center (>600,000 sq. ft.)	3.2	0.8	3.6
Fast Casual Dining	15.25	2.75	17.0
Family Restaurant	9.0	1.5	12.75
Fast-Food Restaurant	12.75	2.25	12.0
Fast-Food Restaurant	15.25	1.25	17.5
Active Entertainment			3
Custom to each tenant			3
Complex	0.19	0.01	0.26
Performing Arts Theater	0.3	0.07	0.33
Arts Area	0.27	0.03	0.3
Pro Football Stadium	0.3	0.01	0.3
Pro Baseball Stadium	0.31	0.01	0.34
Health Club	6.6	0.4	5.5
Convention Center	5.5	0.5	5.5
Hotel—Business	1.0	0.25	0.9
Hotel—Leisure	0.9	0.25	1.0
Restaurant/Lounge	10.0	—	10.0
Conference Center/Parquet (20 to 50 sq. ft./guest room)	30.0	—	30.0
Convention Space (>50 sq. ft./guest room)	20.0	—	10.0
Residential, Rental	0.15	1.5 ²	0.15
Residential, Owned	0.15	1.75	0.15
Office (<25,000 sq. ft.)	0.3	3.5	0.35
Office (25,000 to 100,000 sq. ft.)			2
Sliding scale between 25,000 sq. ft. and 100,000 sq. ft.	0.3	3.5	0.35
Office (100,000 to 500,000 sq. ft.)	0.25	3.15	0.32
Sliding scale between 100,000 sq. ft. and 500,000 sq. ft.			2
Office (>500,000 sq. ft.)	0.25	3.15	0.32
Data Processing Office	0.2	2.6	0.02
Medical/Dental Office	0.25	5.75	0.03
Bank Branch with Drive-in	3.0	1.5	3.0
Bank Branch with Drive-in	3.0	1.6	3.0

Notes

NOTES
 Ratios based on peak parking spaces required with virtually 100% auto use and typical ride-sharing for suburban conditions.
 1/Yes = per thousand sq. ft.
 2/Yes = 24 hours a day remainder shared with visitors and other uses.

Sources: *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 2000; 284: 1033-1038.

- Sources:**
1. Parking Requirements for Shopping Centers, 2nd ed. (Washington, D.C.: Urban Land Institute, 1999).
 2. Parking Generation, 3rd ed. (Washington, D.C.: Institute of Transportation Engineers, 2004).
 3. Data collected by team members.
 4. John W. Dorsett, "Parking Requirements for Health Clubs," *The Planning Professional*, April 2004.
 5. John W. Dorsett, "Parking Requirements for Health Clubs," *The Planning Professional*, April 1988.

Table 2-5 Recommended Time-of-Day Factors for Weekdays

Land Use	User	6 a.m.	7 a.m.	8 a.m.	9 a.m.	10 a.m.	11 a.m.	Noon	1 p.m.	2 p.m.	3 p.m.	4 p.m.	5 p.m.	6 p.m.	7 p.m.	8 p.m.	9 p.m.	10 p.m.	11 p.m.	Midnight	Source	
Shopping Center—Typical —Peak December Late December	Customer	1%	5%	15%	35%	65%	85%	95%	100%	95%	90%	90%	95%	95%	95%	80%	50%	30%	10%	—	1	
	Customer	1%	5%	15%	30%	55%	75%	90%	100%	100%	100%	100%	85%	80%	75%	65%	50%	30%	10%	—	1	
	Customer	1%	5%	10%	20%	40%	65%	90%	100%	100%	100%	100%	85%	70%	55%	40%	25%	15%	5%	—	1	
	Employee	10%	15%	40%	75%	85%	95%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	95%	95%	95%	90%	75%	40%	15%	—	2	
Fine/Casual Dining	Customer	—	—	—	15%	40%	75%	75%	65%	40%	50%	75%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	95%	75%	25%	2	
	Employee	—	20%	50%	75%	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%	75%	75%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	85%	35%	2	
Family Restaurant	Customer	25%	50%	60%	75%	85%	90%	100%	100%	100%	50%	45%	45%	75%	80%	80%	60%	55%	50%	25%	2	
	Employee	50%	75%	90%	90%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	75%	75%	95%	95%	95%	80%	65%	65%	35%	2	
Fast Food	Customer	5%	10%	20%	30%	55%	85%	100%	100%	100%	90%	60%	55%	60%	85%	80%	50%	30%	20%	10%	5%	3
	Employee	15%	20%	30%	40%	75%	100%	100%	100%	95%	70%	60%	70%	90%	90%	90%	60%	40%	30%	20%	2	
Nightclub	Customer	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	25%	50%	75%	100%	100%	100%	2	
	Employee	—	—	—	5%	5%	5%	10%	10%	10%	10%	20%	45%	70%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	2	
Cineplex—Typical Late December	Customer	—	—	—	—	—	—	20%	45%	55%	55%	55%	60%	60%	80%	100%	100%	80%	65%	40%	2,6	
	Employee	—	—	—	—	—	—	35%	60%	75%	80%	80%	80%	70%	80%	100%	100%	85%	70%	55%	2,6	
Performing Arts Theater	Customer	—	—	—	—	—	—	50%	60%	60%	75%	75%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	50%	2	
	Employee	—	10%	10%	20%	20%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	25%	100%	100%	—	—	2	
No matinee Arena	Customer	—	—	—	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	25%	100%	100%	10%	5%	2	
	Employee	—	10%	10%	20%	20%	30%	30%	30%	30%	30%	30%	30%	100%	100%	100%	100%	85%	25%	—	2	
Stadium 8 p.m. start	Customer	—	—	—	1%	1%	1%	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%	10%	50%	100%	100%	85%	25%	—	2	
	Employee	—	10%	10%	20%	20%	20%	30%	30%	30%	30%	30%	30%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	25%	10%	2	
Health Club	Customer	70%	40%	40%	70%	70%	80%	60%	70%	70%	70%	80%	90%	100%	100%	90%	80%	70%	35%	10%	—	2,4
	Employee	75%	75%	75%	75%	75%	75%	75%	75%	75%	75%	75%	100%	100%	100%	75%	50%	20%	20%	—	2,4	
Convention Center	Visitor	—	—	50%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	30%	30%	10%	—	—	2	
	Employee	5%	30%	33%	33%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	40%	25%	20%	5%	—	—	2	
Hotel—Business Hotel—Leisure Restaurant/Lounge Conference/Banquet Convention	Guest	95%	90%	80%	70%	60%	60%	55%	55%	60%	60%	65%	70%	75%	75%	80%	85%	95%	100%	100%	5	
	Guest	95%	95%	90%	80%	70%	70%	65%	65%	70%	70%	75%	80%	85%	90%	95%	95%	100%	100%	100%	2	
	Customer	—	10%	30%	10%	10%	5%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	60%	40%	30%	5,3	
	Customer	—	—	30%	60%	60%	60%	65%	65%	65%	65%	65%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	50%	—	2	
Residential	Customer	—	—	50%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	2	
	Employee	5%	30%	90%	90%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	5%	2	
Residential	Guest	—	10%	20%	20%	20%	20%	20%	20%	20%	20%	20%	20%	40%	60%	100%	100%	100%	80%	50%	2	
	Resident	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	2	
Office	Resident	100%	90%	85%	80%	75%	70%	65%	70%	70%	70%	70%	75%	85%	90%	98%	99%	100%	100%	100%	2	
	Visitor	—	1%	20%	60%	100%	45%	15%	45%	100%	45%	15%	10%	5%	2%	1%	—	—	—	—	2	
Medical/Dental Office	Employee	3%	30%	75%	95%	100%	100%	90%	90%	100%	100%	90%	50%	25%	10%	7%	3%	1%	—	—	3	
	Visitor	—	—	90%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	2	
Bank	Employee	—	—	60%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	2	
	Customer	—	—	50%	90%	100%	50%	50%	50%	70%	40%	80%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	3	

Sources:
 1. Confidential data provided by shopping center owners.
 2. Developed by team members.
 3. Parking Generation, 3rd ed.
 4. John W. Dorett, "Parking Requirements for Health Clubs," *Health Facilities*, April 2004.
 5. Gerald S. "Hotel Parking: How Much is Enough?" *Urban Land*, January 1988.
 6. Parking study conducted by Patton Harris Rust & Associates for the Peterson Companies, 2001.

Table 2-6 Recommended Time-of-Day Factors for Weekends

Land Use	User	6 a.m.	7 a.m.	8 a.m.	9 a.m.	10 a.m.	11 a.m.	Noon	1 p.m.	2 p.m.
Shopping Center—Typical Peak December Late December	Customer	1%	5%	10%	30%	50%	65%	80%	90%	100%
	Customer	1%	5%	10%	35%	60%	70%	85%	95%	100%
	Customer	1%	5%	10%	20%	40%	60%	80%	95%	100%
	Employee	10%	15%	40%	75%	85%	95%	100%	100%	100%
Fine/Casual Dining	Customer	—	—	—	—	—	15%	50%	55%	45%
	Employee	—	20%	30%	60%	75%	75%	75%	75%	75%
	Customer	10%	25%	45%	70%	90%	90%	100%	85%	65%
	Employee	50%	75%	90%	90%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Family Restaurant	Customer	5%	10%	20%	30%	55%	85%	100%	100%	90%
	Employee	15%	20%	30%	40%	75%	100%	100%	100%	95%
	Customer	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Employee	—	—	—	5%	5%	5%	5%	10%	10%
Fast Food	Customer	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Employee	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Customer	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Employee	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Nightclub	Customer	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Employee	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Customer	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Employee	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Cineplex—Typical Late December	Customer	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Employee	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Customer	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Employee	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Performing Arts Theater With matinee	Customer	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Employee	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Customer	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Employee	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Arena (two shows)	Customer	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Employee	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Customer	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Employee	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Stadium (7 p.m. start; see weekday for evening game)	Customer	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Employee	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Customer	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Employee	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Health Club	Customer	80%	45%	35%	50%	35%	50%	50%	30%	25%
	Employee	50%	50%	50%	50%	50%	50%	50%	50%	50%
	Customer	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Employee	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Convention Center	Guest	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Employee	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Customer	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Employee	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Hotel—Business	Guest	95%	90%	80%	70%	60%	60%	55%	55%	60%
	Employee	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Customer	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Employee	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Hotel—Leisure	Guest	95%	90%	80%	70%	60%	60%	55%	55%	60%
	Employee	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Customer	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Employee	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Restaurant/Lounge	Guest	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Employee	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Customer	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Employee	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Conference/Banquet	Guest	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Employee	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Customer	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Employee	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Convention	Guest	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Employee	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Customer	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Employee	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Residential	Guest	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Employee	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Customer	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Employee	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Residential	Guest	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Employee	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Customer	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Employee	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Residential	Guest	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Employee	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Customer	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Employee	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Office	Guest	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Employee	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Customer	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Employee	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Office	Guest	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Employee	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Customer	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Employee	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Medical/Dental Office	Guest	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Employee	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Customer	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Employee	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Bank	Guest	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Employee	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Customer	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Employee	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

18 Shared Parking

3 p.m.	4 p.m.	5 p.m.	6 p.m.	7 p.m.	8 p.m.	9 p.m.	10 p.m.	11 p.m.	Midnight	Source
100%	95%	90%	80%	75%	65%	50%	35%	15%	—	1
100%	95%	90%	80%	75%	65%	50%	35%	15%	—	1
100%	95%	90%	80%	75%	65%	50%	30%	20%	10%	1
100%	100%	95%	85%	80%	75%	65%	45%	15%	—	2
45%	45%	60%	90%	95%	100%	90%	90%	90%	50%	2
75%	75%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	85%	50%	2
40%	45%	60%	70%	70%	65%	30%	25%	15%	10%	2
75%	75%	95%	95%	95%	95%	80%	65%	65%	35%	2
60%	55%	60%	85%	80%	50%	30%	20%	10%	5%	3
70%	60%	70%	90%	90%	60%	40%	30%	20%	20%	2
—	—	—	—	25%	50%	75%	100%	100%	100%	2
10%	20%	45%	70%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	2
55%	55%	60%	60%	80%	100%	100%	100%	80%	50%	2.6
80%	80%	80%	70%	80%	100%	100%	100%	85%	70%	2.6
75%	75%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	50%	2
100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	5%	2
85%	25%	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2
100%	25%	10%	5%	5%	—	—	—	—	—	2
30%	55%	100%	95%	60%	30%	10%	1%	1%	—	2.4
50%	75%	100%	100%	75%	50%	20%	20%	20%	—	2.4
100%	100%	100%	50%	30%	30%	10%	—	—	—	2
100%	90%	70%	40%	25%	20%	20%	5%	—	—	2
60%	65%	70%	75%	75%	80%	85%	95%	100%	100%	5
70%	75%	80%	85%	85%	90%	95%	95%	100%	100%	2
10%	10%	30%	55%	60%	70%	67%	60%	40%	30%	5
65%	65%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	50%	—	—	5
100%	100%	100%	50%	30%	30%	10%	—	—	—	2
100%	90%	75%	60%	55%	55%	45%	45%	30%	5	5
20%	20%	40%	60%	100%	100%	100%	100%	80%	50%	2
100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	2
70%	75%	85%	90%	97%	98%	94%	100%	100%	100%	2
40%	20%	10%	5%	—	—	—	—	—	—	2
40%	20%	10%	5%	—	—	—	—	—	—	3
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	3

Sources:
1. Confidential data provided by shopping center managers.
2. Developed by team members.
3. John W. Dorsett, "Parking Requirements for Health Clubs," Washington, D.C.: Institute of Transportation Engineers, 2004.
4. John W. Dorsett, "Parking Requirements for Health Clubs," The Parking Professional, April 2004.
5. Gerald Salzman, "Hotel Parking: How Much Is Enough?" Urban Land Institute, 1988.
6. Parking study conducted by Patton Harris Rust & Associates for the Peterson Companies, 2001.

Key Findings 19

Capacity Analysis – Existing Conditions

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis

1: Highland Ave & Campbell St

02/21/2019

						
Movement	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	NBL	NBR
Lane Configurations						
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	143	36	13	89	18	39
Future Volume (Veh/h)	143	36	13	89	18	39
Sign Control	Free			Free	Stop	
Grade	0%			0%	0%	
Peak Hour Factor	0.87	0.87	0.87	0.87	0.87	0.87
Hourly flow rate (vph)	164	41	15	102	21	45
Pedestrians				7	9	
Lane Width (ft)				12.0	12.0	
Walking Speed (ft/s)				3.5	3.5	
Percent Blockage				1	1	
Right turn flare (veh)						
Median type	None			None		
Median storage veh						
Upstream signal (ft)						
pX, platoon unblocked						
vC, conflicting volume			214		326	200
vC1, stage 1 conf vol						
vC2, stage 2 conf vol						
vCu, unblocked vol			214		326	200
tC, single (s)			4.1		6.4	6.2
tC, 2 stage (s)						
tF (s)			2.2		3.5	3.3
p0 queue free %			99		97	95
cM capacity (veh/h)			1356		660	833
Direction, Lane #	EB 1	WB 1	NB 1			
Volume Total	205	117	66			
Volume Left	0	15	21			
Volume Right	41	0	45			
cSH	1700	1356	769			
Volume to Capacity	0.12	0.01	0.09			
Queue Length 95th (ft)	0	1	7			
Control Delay (s)	0.0	1.1	10.1			
Lane LOS		A	B			
Approach Delay (s)	0.0	1.1	10.1			
Approach LOS			B			
Intersection Summary						
Average Delay			2.0			
Intersection Capacity Utilization			28.2%	ICU Level of Service		A
Analysis Period (min)			15			

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis

2: Chestnut Ave & Campbell St

02/21/2019

												
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations												
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	13	170	6	2	107	6	4	4	2	6	5	8
Future Volume (Veh/h)	13	170	6	2	107	6	4	4	2	6	5	8
Sign Control		Free			Free			Stop			Stop	
Grade		0%			0%			0%			0%	
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92
Hourly flow rate (vph)	14	185	7	2	116	7	4	4	2	7	5	9
Pedestrians		4			6			7			7	
Lane Width (ft)		12.0			12.0			12.0			12.0	
Walking Speed (ft/s)		3.5			3.5			3.5			3.5	
Percent Blockage		0			1			1			1	
Right turn flare (veh)												
Median type		None			None							
Median storage (veh)												
Upstream signal (ft)												
pX, platoon unblocked												
vC, conflicting volume	130			199			362	358	202	357	358	130
vC1, stage 1 conf vol												
vC2, stage 2 conf vol												
vCu, unblocked vol	130			199			362	358	202	357	358	130
tC, single (s)	4.1			4.1			7.1	6.5	6.2	7.1	6.5	6.2
tC, 2 stage (s)												
tF (s)	2.2			2.2			3.5	4.0	3.3	3.5	4.0	3.3
p0 queue free %	99			100			99	99	100	99	99	99
cM capacity (veh/h)	1446			1364			567	555	829	575	555	909
Direction, Lane #	EB 1	WB 1	NB 1	SB 1								
Volume Total	206	125	10	21								
Volume Left	14	2	4	7								
Volume Right	7	7	2	9								
cSH	1446	1364	599	676								
Volume to Capacity	0.01	0.00	0.02	0.03								
Queue Length 95th (ft)	1	0	1	2								
Control Delay (s)	0.6	0.1	11.1	10.5								
Lane LOS	A	A	B	B								
Approach Delay (s)	0.6	0.1	11.1	10.5								
Approach LOS			B	B								
Intersection Summary												
Average Delay			1.3									
Intersection Capacity Utilization			28.4%		ICU Level of Service				A			
Analysis Period (min)			15									

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis

3: Highland Ave & Sigwalt St

02/21/2019

												
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations												
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	4	197	4	13	120	28	15	15	23	20	8	5
Future Volume (Veh/h)	4	197	4	13	120	28	15	15	23	20	8	5
Sign Control		Free			Free			Stop			Stop	
Grade		0%			0%			0%			0%	
Peak Hour Factor	0.70	0.70	0.70	0.70	0.70	0.70	0.70	0.70	0.70	0.70	0.70	0.70
Hourly flow rate (vph)	6	281	6	19	171	40	21	21	33	29	11	7
Pedestrians		2									2	
Lane Width (ft)		12.0									12.0	
Walking Speed (ft/s)		3.5									3.5	
Percent Blockage		0									0	
Right turn flare (veh)												
Median type		None			None							
Median storage (veh)												
Upstream signal (ft)												
pX, platoon unblocked												
vC, conflicting volume	213			287			540	547	284	570	530	195
vC1, stage 1 conf vol												
vC2, stage 2 conf vol												
vCu, unblocked vol	213			287			540	547	284	570	530	195
tC, single (s)	4.1			4.1			7.1	6.5	6.2	7.1	6.5	6.2
tC, 2 stage (s)												
tF (s)	2.2			2.2			3.5	4.0	3.3	3.5	4.0	3.3
p0 queue free %	100			99			95	95	96	93	98	99
cM capacity (veh/h)	1367			1287			436	438	750	387	448	848
Direction, Lane #	EB 1	WB 1	NB 1	SB 1								
Volume Total	293	230	75	47								
Volume Left	6	19	21	29								
Volume Right	6	40	33	7								
cSH	1367	1287	535	436								
Volume to Capacity	0.00	0.01	0.14	0.11								
Queue Length 95th (ft)	0	1	12	9								
Control Delay (s)	0.2	0.8	12.8	14.3								
Lane LOS	A	A	B	B								
Approach Delay (s)	0.2	0.8	12.8	14.3								
Approach LOS			B	B								
Intersection Summary												
Average Delay			2.9									
Intersection Capacity Utilization			26.1%		ICU Level of Service				A			
Analysis Period (min)			15									

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis

4: Chestnut Ave & Sigwalt St

02/21/2019

												
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations												
Sign Control		Stop			Stop			Stop			Stop	
Traffic Volume (vph)	3	192	3	4	127	9	2	1	5	8	8	2
Future Volume (vph)	3	192	3	4	127	9	2	1	5	8	8	2
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92
Hourly flow rate (vph)	3	209	3	4	138	10	2	1	5	9	9	2
Direction, Lane #	EB 1	WB 1	NB 1	SB 1								
Volume Total (vph)	215	152	8	20								
Volume Left (vph)	3	4	2	9								
Volume Right (vph)	3	10	5	2								
Hadj (s)	0.03	0.00	-0.29	0.06								
Departure Headway (s)	4.1	4.2	4.4	4.8								
Degree Utilization, x	0.25	0.18	0.01	0.03								
Capacity (veh/h)	854	847	743	691								
Control Delay (s)	8.5	8.1	7.5	7.9								
Approach Delay (s)	8.5	8.1	7.5	7.9								
Approach LOS	A	A	A	A								
Intersection Summary												
Delay			8.3									
Level of Service			A									
Intersection Capacity Utilization			22.7%		ICU Level of Service				A			
Analysis Period (min)			15									

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis

5: Vail Ave & Campbell St

02/21/2019

												
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations												
Sign Control		Stop			Stop			Stop			Stop	
Traffic Volume (vph)	51	97	25	18	50	11	9	63	6	18	86	27
Future Volume (vph)	51	97	25	18	50	11	9	63	6	18	86	27
Peak Hour Factor	0.82	0.82	0.82	0.82	0.82	0.82	0.82	0.82	0.82	0.82	0.82	0.82
Hourly flow rate (vph)	62	118	30	22	61	13	11	77	7	22	105	33
Direction, Lane #	EB 1	EB 2	WB 1	WB 2	NB 1	SB 1	SB 2					
Volume Total (vph)	180	30	83	13	95	127	33					
Volume Left (vph)	62	0	22	0	11	22	0					
Volume Right (vph)	0	30	0	13	7	0	33					
Hadj (s)	0.17	-0.70	0.21	-0.70	0.04	0.20	-0.63					
Departure Headway (s)	5.5	4.6	5.6	4.7	5.6	5.6	4.8					
Degree Utilization, x	0.27	0.04	0.13	0.02	0.15	0.20	0.04					
Capacity (veh/h)	624	738	600	711	612	606	705					
Control Delay (s)	9.3	6.6	8.3	6.6	9.5	8.8	6.8					
Approach Delay (s)	9.0		8.1		9.5	8.4						
Approach LOS	A		A		A	A						
Intersection Summary												
Delay			8.7									
Level of Service			A									
Intersection Capacity Utilization			36.4%	ICU Level of Service				A				
Analysis Period (min)			15									

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis

6: Vail Ave & Sigwalt St

02/21/2019

												
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations												
Sign Control		Stop			Stop			Stop			Stop	
Traffic Volume (vph)	21	213	6	10	146	48	11	54	14	67	39	4
Future Volume (vph)	21	213	6	10	146	48	11	54	14	67	39	4
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92
Hourly flow rate (vph)	23	232	7	11	159	52	12	59	15	73	42	4
Direction, Lane #	EB 1	WB 1	NB 1	SB 1								
Volume Total (vph)	262	222	86	119								
Volume Left (vph)	23	11	12	73								
Volume Right (vph)	7	52	15	4								
Hadj (s)	0.04	-0.10	-0.04	0.14								
Departure Headway (s)	4.8	4.7	5.2	5.3								
Degree Utilization, x	0.35	0.29	0.12	0.18								
Capacity (veh/h)	712	722	617	609								
Control Delay (s)	10.3	9.6	9.0	9.5								
Approach Delay (s)	10.3	9.6	9.0	9.5								
Approach LOS	B	A	A	A								
Intersection Summary												
Delay				9.8								
Level of Service				A								
Intersection Capacity Utilization				38.7%	ICU Level of Service	A						
Analysis Period (min)				15								

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis

7: Ridge Ave & Campbell St

02/21/2019

												
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations												
Sign Control		Stop			Stop			Stop			Stop	
Traffic Volume (vph)	46	133	23	9	77	14	25	120	9	28	163	40
Future Volume (vph)	46	133	23	9	77	14	25	120	9	28	163	40
Peak Hour Factor	0.88	0.88	0.88	0.88	0.88	0.88	0.88	0.88	0.88	0.88	0.88	0.88
Hourly flow rate (vph)	52	151	26	10	88	16	28	136	10	32	185	45
Direction, Lane #	EB 1	WB 1	NB 1	SB 1								
Volume Total (vph)	229	114	174	262								
Volume Left (vph)	52	10	28	32								
Volume Right (vph)	26	16	10	45								
Hadj (s)	0.00	-0.01	0.01	-0.06								
Departure Headway (s)	5.2	5.4	5.3	5.1								
Degree Utilization, x	0.33	0.17	0.25	0.37								
Capacity (veh/h)	635	596	633	665								
Control Delay (s)	10.8	9.5	10.0	11.0								
Approach Delay (s)	10.8	9.5	10.0	11.0								
Approach LOS	B	A	B	B								
Intersection Summary												
Delay			10.5									
Level of Service			B									
Intersection Capacity Utilization			39.8%		ICU Level of Service					A		
Analysis Period (min)			15									

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis

8: Mitchell Ave & Campbell St

02/21/2019

						
Movement	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	NBL	NBR
Lane Configurations						
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	166	2	3	90	8	9
Future Volume (Veh/h)	166	2	3	90	8	9
Sign Control	Free			Free	Stop	
Grade	0%			0%	0%	
Peak Hour Factor	0.84	0.84	0.84	0.84	0.84	0.84
Hourly flow rate (vph)	198	2	4	107	10	11
Pedestrians					3	
Lane Width (ft)					12.0	
Walking Speed (ft/s)					3.5	
Percent Blockage					0	
Right turn flare (veh)						
Median type	None			None		
Median storage veh						
Upstream signal (ft)						
pX, platoon unblocked						
vC, conflicting volume			203		317	202
vC1, stage 1 conf vol						
vC2, stage 2 conf vol						
vCu, unblocked vol			203		317	202
tC, single (s)			4.1		6.4	6.2
tC, 2 stage (s)						
tF (s)			2.2		3.5	3.3
p0 queue free %			100		99	99
cM capacity (veh/h)			1377		676	841
Direction, Lane #	EB 1	WB 1	NB 1			
Volume Total	200	111	21			
Volume Left	0	4	10			
Volume Right	2	0	11			
cSH	1700	1377	754			
Volume to Capacity	0.12	0.00	0.03			
Queue Length 95th (ft)	0	0	2			
Control Delay (s)	0.0	0.3	9.9			
Lane LOS		A	A			
Approach Delay (s)	0.0	0.3	9.9			
Approach LOS			A			
Intersection Summary						
Average Delay		0.7				
Intersection Capacity Utilization		19.3%	ICU Level of Service	A		
Analysis Period (min)		15				

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis

9: Chestnut Ave & Wing St

02/21/2019

						
Movement	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	NBL	NBR
Lane Configurations						
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	26	5	18	33	3	13
Future Volume (Veh/h)	26	5	18	33	3	13
Sign Control	Free			Free	Stop	
Grade	0%			0%	0%	
Peak Hour Factor	0.91	0.91	0.91	0.91	0.91	0.91
Hourly flow rate (vph)	29	5	20	36	3	14
Pedestrians	1					
Lane Width (ft)	12.0					
Walking Speed (ft/s)	3.5					
Percent Blockage	0					
Right turn flare (veh)						
Median type	None			None		
Median storage veh						
Upstream signal (ft)						
pX, platoon unblocked						
vC, conflicting volume			34		108	32
vC1, stage 1 conf vol						
vC2, stage 2 conf vol						
vCu, unblocked vol			34		108	32
tC, single (s)			4.1		6.4	6.3
tC, 2 stage (s)						
tF (s)			2.2		3.5	3.4
p0 queue free %			99		100	99
cM capacity (veh/h)			1591		882	1026
Direction, Lane #	EB 1	WB 1	NB 1			
Volume Total	34	56	17			
Volume Left	0	20	3			
Volume Right	5	0	14			
cSH	1700	1591	997			
Volume to Capacity	0.02	0.01	0.02			
Queue Length 95th (ft)	0	1	1			
Control Delay (s)	0.0	2.7	8.7			
Lane LOS		A	A			
Approach Delay (s)	0.0	2.7	8.7			
Approach LOS			A			
Intersection Summary						
Average Delay		2.8				
Intersection Capacity Utilization		19.4%	ICU Level of Service	A		
Analysis Period (min)		15				

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis

10: Dunton Ave & Campbell St

02/21/2019

												
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations												
Sign Control		Stop			Stop			Stop			Stop	
Traffic Volume (vph)	21	78	18	6	38	13	10	56	10	13	73	31
Future Volume (vph)	21	78	18	6	38	13	10	56	10	13	73	31
Peak Hour Factor	0.82	0.82	0.82	0.82	0.82	0.82	0.82	0.82	0.82	0.82	0.82	0.82
Hourly flow rate (vph)	26	95	22	7	46	16	12	68	12	16	89	38
Direction, Lane #	EB 1	WB 1	NB 1	SB 1								
Volume Total (vph)	143	69	92	143								
Volume Left (vph)	26	7	12	16								
Volume Right (vph)	22	16	12	38								
Hadj (s)	-0.04	-0.08	0.02	-0.08								
Departure Headway (s)	4.5	4.5	4.6	4.4								
Degree Utilization, x	0.18	0.09	0.12	0.18								
Capacity (veh/h)	751	737	739	764								
Control Delay (s)	8.5	8.0	8.2	8.4								
Approach Delay (s)	8.5	8.0	8.2	8.4								
Approach LOS	A	A	A	A								
Intersection Summary												
Delay			8.3									
Level of Service			A									
Intersection Capacity Utilization			27.8%		ICU Level of Service				A			
Analysis Period (min)			15									

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis

11: Highland Ave & North Garage Ramp

02/21/2019

						
Movement	WBL	WBR	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT
Lane Configurations						
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	12	13	44	10	17	32
Future Volume (Veh/h)	12	13	44	10	17	32
Sign Control	Stop		Free			Free
Grade	0%		0%			0%
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92
Hourly flow rate (vph)	13	14	48	11	18	35
Pedestrians						
Lane Width (ft)						
Walking Speed (ft/s)						
Percent Blockage						
Right turn flare (veh)						
Median type			None			None
Median storage veh)						
Upstream signal (ft)						
pX, platoon unblocked						
vC, conflicting volume	124	54			59	
vC1, stage 1 conf vol						
vC2, stage 2 conf vol						
vCu, unblocked vol	124	54			59	
tC, single (s)	6.4	6.2			4.1	
tC, 2 stage (s)						
tF (s)	3.5	3.3			2.2	
p0 queue free %	98	99			99	
cM capacity (veh/h)	860	1014			1545	
Direction, Lane #	WB 1	NB 1	SB 1			
Volume Total	27	59	53			
Volume Left	13	0	18			
Volume Right	14	11	0			
cSH	934	1700	1545			
Volume to Capacity	0.03	0.03	0.01			
Queue Length 95th (ft)	2	0	1			
Control Delay (s)	9.0	0.0	2.6			
Lane LOS	A		A			
Approach Delay (s)	9.0	0.0	2.6			
Approach LOS	A					
Intersection Summary						
Average Delay		2.7				
Intersection Capacity Utilization		19.3%		ICU Level of Service		A
Analysis Period (min)		15				

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis12: Highland Ave & South Garage Ramp

02/21/2019

												
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations												
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	0	0	0	8	0	15	0	39	6	4	40	0
Future Volume (Veh/h)	0	0	0	8	0	15	0	39	6	4	40	0
Sign Control	Stop			Stop			Free			Free		
Grade	0%			0%			0%			0%		
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92
Hourly flow rate (vph)	0	0	0	9	0	16	0	42	7	4	43	0
Pedestrians												
Lane Width (ft)												
Walking Speed (ft/s)												
Percent Blockage												
Right turn flare (veh)												
Median type							None			None		
Median storage (veh)												
Upstream signal (ft)												
pX, platoon unblocked												
vC, conflicting volume	112	100	43	96	96	46	43				49	
vC1, stage 1 conf vol												
vC2, stage 2 conf vol												
vCu, unblocked vol	112	100	43	96	96	46	43				49	
tC, single (s)	7.1	6.5	6.2	7.1	6.5	6.2	4.1				4.1	
tC, 2 stage (s)												
tF (s)	3.5	4.0	3.3	3.5	4.0	3.3	2.2				2.2	
p0 queue free %	100	100	100	99	100	98	100				100	
cM capacity (veh/h)	850	788	1027	884	792	1024	1566				1558	
Direction, Lane #	WB 1	NB 1	SB 1									
Volume Total	25	49	47									
Volume Left	9	0	4									
Volume Right	16	7	0									
cSH	969	1700	1558									
Volume to Capacity	0.03	0.03	0.00									
Queue Length 95th (ft)	2	0	0									
Control Delay (s)	8.8	0.0	0.6									
Lane LOS	A		A									
Approach Delay (s)	8.8	0.0	0.6									
Approach LOS	A											
Intersection Summary												
Average Delay	2.1											
Intersection Capacity Utilization	15.4%			ICU Level of Service			A					
Analysis Period (min)	15											

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis

1: Highland Ave & Campbell St

03/15/2019

						
Movement	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	NBL	NBR
Lane Configurations						
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	153	39	53	150	43	67
Future Volume (Veh/h)	153	39	53	150	43	67
Sign Control	Free			Free	Stop	
Grade	0%			0%	0%	
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92
Hourly flow rate (vph)	166	42	58	163	47	73
Pedestrians	25			25	25	
Lane Width (ft)	12.0			12.0	12.0	
Walking Speed (ft/s)	3.5			3.5	3.5	
Percent Blockage	2			2	2	
Right turn flare (veh)						
Median type	None			None		
Median storage veh						
Upstream signal (ft)						
pX, platoon unblocked						
vC, conflicting volume			233		516	237
vC1, stage 1 conf vol						
vC2, stage 2 conf vol						
vCu, unblocked vol			233		516	237
tC, single (s)			4.1		6.4	6.2
tC, 2 stage (s)						
tF (s)			2.2		3.5	3.3
p0 queue free %			96		90	90
cM capacity (veh/h)			1303		473	764
Direction, Lane #	EB 1	WB 1	NB 1			
Volume Total	208	221	120			
Volume Left	0	58	47			
Volume Right	42	0	73			
cSH	1700	1303	616			
Volume to Capacity	0.12	0.04	0.19			
Queue Length 95th (ft)	0	3	18			
Control Delay (s)	0.0	2.4	12.3			
Lane LOS		A	B			
Approach Delay (s)	0.0	2.4	12.3			
Approach LOS			B			
Intersection Summary						
Average Delay		3.6				
Intersection Capacity Utilization		44.1%		ICU Level of Service		A
Analysis Period (min)		15				

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis

2: Chestnut Ave & Campbell St

03/15/2019

												
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations												
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	34	175	13	13	130	40	4	8	7	13	13	30
Future Volume (Veh/h)	34	175	13	13	130	40	4	8	7	13	13	30
Sign Control		Free			Free			Stop			Stop	
Grade		0%			0%			0%			0%	
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92
Hourly flow rate (vph)	37	190	14	14	141	43	4	9	8	14	14	33
Pedestrians		25			25			25			25	
Lane Width (ft)		12.0			12.0			12.0			12.0	
Walking Speed (ft/s)		3.5			3.5			3.5			3.5	
Percent Blockage		2			2			2			2	
Right turn flare (veh)												
Median type		None			None							
Median storage (veh)												
Upstream signal (ft)												
pX, platoon unblocked												
vC, conflicting volume	209			229			552	533	247	524	518	212
vC1, stage 1 conf vol												
vC2, stage 2 conf vol												
vCu, unblocked vol	209			229			552	533	247	524	518	212
tC, single (s)	4.1			4.1			7.1	6.5	6.2	7.1	6.5	6.2
tC, 2 stage (s)												
tF (s)	2.2			2.2			3.5	4.0	3.3	3.5	4.0	3.3
p0 queue free %	97			99			99	98	99	97	97	96
cM capacity (veh/h)	1329			1307			371	415	754	403	423	789
Direction, Lane #	EB 1	WB 1	NB 1	SB 1								
Volume Total	241	198	21	61								
Volume Left	37	14	4	14								
Volume Right	14	43	8	33								
cSH	1329	1307	487	556								
Volume to Capacity	0.03	0.01	0.04	0.11								
Queue Length 95th (ft)	2	1	3	9								
Control Delay (s)	1.4	0.6	12.7	12.3								
Lane LOS	A	A	B	B								
Approach Delay (s)	1.4	0.6	12.7	12.3								
Approach LOS			B	B								
Intersection Summary												
Average Delay			2.8									
Intersection Capacity Utilization			37.1%		ICU Level of Service				A			
Analysis Period (min)			15									

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis

3: Highland Ave & Sigwalt St

03/15/2019

														
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR		
Lane Configurations														
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	5	118	9	13	150	43	4	21	19	44	34	35		
Future Volume (Veh/h)	5	118	9	13	150	43	4	21	19	44	34	35		
Sign Control		Free			Free			Stop			Stop			
Grade		0%			0%			0%			0%			
Peak Hour Factor	0.89	0.89	0.89	0.89	0.89	0.89	0.89	0.89	0.89	0.89	0.89	0.89		
Hourly flow rate (vph)	6	133	10	15	169	48	4	24	21	49	38	39		
Pedestrians		25			25			25			25			
Lane Width (ft)		12.0			12.0			12.0			12.0			
Walking Speed (ft/s)		3.5			3.5			3.5			3.5			
Percent Blockage		2			2			2			2			
Right turn flare (veh)														
Median type	None			None										
Median storage (veh)														
Upstream signal (ft)														
pX, platoon unblocked														
vC, conflicting volume	242				168				481	447	188	456	428	243
vC1, stage 1 conf vol														
vC2, stage 2 conf vol														
vCu, unblocked vol	242				168				481	447	188	456	428	243
tC, single (s)	4.1				4.1				7.1	6.5	6.2	7.1	6.5	6.2
tC, 2 stage (s)														
tF (s)	2.2				2.2				3.5	4.0	3.3	3.5	4.0	3.3
p0 queue free %	100				99				99	95	97	89	92	95
cM capacity (veh/h)	1293				1376				401	475	814	438	487	758
Direction, Lane #	EB 1	WB 1	NB 1	SB 1										
Volume Total	149	232	49	126										
Volume Left	6	15	4	49										
Volume Right	10	48	21	39										
cSH	1293	1376	568	522										
Volume to Capacity	0.00	0.01	0.09	0.24										
Queue Length 95th (ft)	0	1	7	23										
Control Delay (s)	0.4	0.6	11.9	14.1										
Lane LOS	A	A	B	B										
Approach Delay (s)	0.4	0.6	11.9	14.1										
Approach LOS			B	B										
Intersection Summary														
Average Delay				4.6										
Intersection Capacity Utilization				36.7%	ICU Level of Service				A					
Analysis Period (min)				15										

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis

4: Chestnut Ave & Sigwalt St

03/15/2019

												
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations												
Sign Control		Stop			Stop			Stop			Stop	
Traffic Volume (vph)	7	108	2	5	156	28	3	3	4	20	7	5
Future Volume (vph)	7	108	2	5	156	28	3	3	4	20	7	5
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92
Hourly flow rate (vph)	8	117	2	5	170	30	3	3	4	22	8	5
Direction, Lane #	EB 1	WB 1	NB 1	SB 1								
Volume Total (vph)	127	205	10	35								
Volume Left (vph)	8	5	3	22								
Volume Right (vph)	2	30	4	5								
Hadj (s)	0.04	-0.05	-0.15	0.07								
Departure Headway (s)	4.2	4.1	4.5	4.7								
Degree Utilization, x	0.15	0.23	0.01	0.05								
Capacity (veh/h)	828	865	733	704								
Control Delay (s)	8.0	8.3	7.6	7.9								
Approach Delay (s)	8.0	8.3	7.6	7.9								
Approach LOS	A	A	A	A								
Intersection Summary												
Delay				8.2								
Level of Service				A								
Intersection Capacity Utilization				28.5%	ICU Level of Service	A						
Analysis Period (min)				15								

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis

5: Vail Ave & Campbell St

03/15/2019

												
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations												
Sign Control		Stop			Stop			Stop			Stop	
Traffic Volume (vph)	67	83	34	39	103	33	32	91	33	35	146	60
Future Volume (vph)	67	83	34	39	103	33	32	91	33	35	146	60
Peak Hour Factor	0.89	0.89	0.89	0.89	0.89	0.89	0.89	0.89	0.89	0.89	0.89	0.89
Hourly flow rate (vph)	75	93	38	44	116	37	36	102	37	39	164	67
Direction, Lane #	EB 1	EB 2	WB 1	WB 2	NB 1	SB 1	SB 2					
Volume Total (vph)	168	38	160	37	175	203	67					
Volume Left (vph)	75	0	44	0	36	39	0					
Volume Right (vph)	0	38	0	37	37	0	67					
Hadj (s)	0.26	-0.67	0.17	-0.67	-0.05	0.13	-0.67					
Departure Headway (s)	6.4	5.4	6.3	5.4	6.0	6.1	5.3					
Degree Utilization, x	0.30	0.06	0.28	0.06	0.29	0.34	0.10					
Capacity (veh/h)	530	613	535	610	562	560	637					
Control Delay (s)	10.8	7.6	10.5	7.6	11.5	11.0	7.6					
Approach Delay (s)	10.2		10.0		11.5	10.2						
Approach LOS	B		A		B	B						
Intersection Summary												
Delay			10.4									
Level of Service			B									
Intersection Capacity Utilization			47.9%	ICU Level of Service				A				
Analysis Period (min)			15									

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis

6: Vail Ave & Sigwalt St

03/15/2019

												
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations												
Sign Control		Stop			Stop			Stop			Stop	
Traffic Volume (vph)	23	144	4	15	152	99	15	63	18	79	44	39
Future Volume (vph)	23	144	4	15	152	99	15	63	18	79	44	39
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92
Hourly flow rate (vph)	25	157	4	16	165	108	16	68	20	86	48	42
Direction, Lane #	EB 1	WB 1	NB 1	SB 1								
Volume Total (vph)	186	289	104	176								
Volume Left (vph)	25	16	16	86								
Volume Right (vph)	4	108	20	42								
Hadj (s)	0.05	-0.18	-0.05	-0.01								
Departure Headway (s)	5.1	4.8	5.3	5.3								
Degree Utilization, x	0.26	0.38	0.15	0.26								
Capacity (veh/h)	652	714	595	625								
Control Delay (s)	9.9	10.7	9.3	10.1								
Approach Delay (s)	9.9	10.7	9.3	10.1								
Approach LOS	A	B	A	B								
Intersection Summary												
Delay				10.2								
Level of Service				B								
Intersection Capacity Utilization				40.2%	ICU Level of Service	A						
Analysis Period (min)				15								

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis

7: Ridge Ave & Campbell St

03/15/2019

												
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations												
Sign Control		Stop			Stop			Stop			Stop	
Traffic Volume (vph)	76	136	34	11	119	22	31	180	11	17	124	61
Future Volume (vph)	76	136	34	11	119	22	31	180	11	17	124	61
Peak Hour Factor	0.91	0.91	0.91	0.91	0.91	0.91	0.91	0.91	0.91	0.91	0.91	0.91
Hourly flow rate (vph)	84	149	37	12	131	24	34	198	12	19	136	67
Direction, Lane #	EB 1	WB 1	NB 1	SB 1								
Volume Total (vph)	270	167	244	222								
Volume Left (vph)	84	12	34	19								
Volume Right (vph)	37	24	12	67								
Hadj (s)	0.01	-0.04	0.03	-0.13								
Departure Headway (s)	5.5	5.7	5.6	5.5								
Degree Utilization, x	0.42	0.26	0.38	0.34								
Capacity (veh/h)	601	567	590	602								
Control Delay (s)	12.4	10.7	11.9	11.2								
Approach Delay (s)	12.4	10.7	11.9	11.2								
Approach LOS	B	B	B	B								
Intersection Summary												
Delay				11.7								
Level of Service				B								
Intersection Capacity Utilization				53.5%	ICU Level of Service	A						
Analysis Period (min)				15								

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis

8: Mitchell Ave & Campbell St

03/15/2019

						
Movement	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	NBL	NBR
Lane Configurations						
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	172	5	8	143	3	8
Future Volume (Veh/h)	172	5	8	143	3	8
Sign Control	Free			Free	Stop	
Grade	0%			0%	0%	
Peak Hour Factor	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93
Hourly flow rate (vph)	185	5	9	154	3	9
Pedestrians	25			25	25	
Lane Width (ft)	12.0			12.0	12.0	
Walking Speed (ft/s)	3.5			3.5	3.5	
Percent Blockage	2			2	2	
Right turn flare (veh)						
Median type	None			None		
Median storage veh)						
Upstream signal (ft)						
pX, platoon unblocked						
vC, conflicting volume				215	410	238
vC1, stage 1 conf vol						
vC2, stage 2 conf vol						
vCu, unblocked vol				215	410	238
tC, single (s)				4.1	6.4	6.2
tC, 2 stage (s)						
tF (s)				2.2	3.5	3.3
p0 queue free %				99	99	99
cM capacity (veh/h)				1323	566	764
Direction, Lane #	EB 1	WB 1	NB 1			
Volume Total	190	163	12			
Volume Left	0	9	3			
Volume Right	5	0	9			
cSH	1700	1323	702			
Volume to Capacity	0.11	0.01	0.02			
Queue Length 95th (ft)	0	1	1			
Control Delay (s)	0.0	0.5	10.2			
Lane LOS		A	B			
Approach Delay (s)	0.0	0.5	10.2			
Approach LOS			B			
Intersection Summary						
Average Delay				0.6		
Intersection Capacity Utilization				29.7%	ICU Level of Service	A
Analysis Period (min)				15		

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis9: Chestnut Ave & Wing St

03/15/2019

						
Movement	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	NBL	NBR
Lane Configurations						
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	67	3	46	79	4	71
Future Volume (Veh/h)	67	3	46	79	4	71
Sign Control	Free			Free	Stop	
Grade	0%			0%	0%	
Peak Hour Factor	0.84	0.84	0.84	0.84	0.84	0.84
Hourly flow rate (vph)	80	4	55	94	5	85
Pedestrians	25			25	25	
Lane Width (ft)	12.0			12.0	12.0	
Walking Speed (ft/s)	3.5			3.5	3.5	
Percent Blockage	2			2	2	
Right turn flare (veh)						
Median type	None			None		
Median storage veh						
Upstream signal (ft)						
pX, platoon unblocked						
vC, conflicting volume			109		336	132
vC1, stage 1 conf vol						
vC2, stage 2 conf vol						
vCu, unblocked vol			109		336	132
tC, single (s)			4.1		6.4	6.2
tC, 2 stage (s)						
tF (s)			2.2		3.5	3.3
p0 queue free %			96		99	90
cM capacity (veh/h)			1446		604	874
Direction, Lane #	EB 1	WB 1	NB 1			
Volume Total	84	149	90			
Volume Left	0	55	5			
Volume Right	4	0	85			
cSH	1700	1446	853			
Volume to Capacity	0.05	0.04	0.11			
Queue Length 95th (ft)	0	3	9			
Control Delay (s)	0.0	3.0	9.7			
Lane LOS		A	A			
Approach Delay (s)	0.0	3.0	9.7			
Approach LOS			A			
Intersection Summary						
Average Delay			4.1			
Intersection Capacity Utilization			30.5%	ICU Level of Service		A
Analysis Period (min)			15			

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis

10: Dunton Ave & Campbell St

03/15/2019

												
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations												
Sign Control		Stop			Stop			Stop			Stop	
Traffic Volume (vph)	32	80	30	20	93	36	43	127	25	28	107	45
Future Volume (vph)	32	80	30	20	93	36	43	127	25	28	107	45
Peak Hour Factor	0.88	0.88	0.88	0.88	0.88	0.88	0.88	0.88	0.88	0.88	0.88	0.88
Hourly flow rate (vph)	36	91	34	23	106	41	49	144	28	32	122	51
Direction, Lane #	EB 1	WB 1	NB 1	SB 1								
Volume Total (vph)	161	170	221	205								
Volume Left (vph)	36	23	49	32								
Volume Right (vph)	34	41	28	51								
Hadj (s)	-0.05	-0.08	0.00	-0.08								
Departure Headway (s)	5.2	5.2	5.1	5.0								
Degree Utilization, x	0.23	0.25	0.31	0.29								
Capacity (veh/h)	625	632	658	661								
Control Delay (s)	9.8	9.9	10.4	10.1								
Approach Delay (s)	9.8	9.9	10.4	10.1								
Approach LOS	A	A	B	B								
Intersection Summary												
Delay			10.1									
Level of Service			B									
Intersection Capacity Utilization			36.4%	ICU Level of Service					A			
Analysis Period (min)			15									

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis

11: Highland Ave & North Garage Ramp

03/15/2019

						
Movement	WBL	WBR	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT
Lane Configurations						
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	25	58	52	8	26	66
Future Volume (Veh/h)	25	58	52	8	26	66
Sign Control	Stop		Free			Free
Grade	0%		0%			0%
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92
Hourly flow rate (vph)	27	63	57	9	28	72
Pedestrians						
Lane Width (ft)						
Walking Speed (ft/s)						
Percent Blockage						
Right turn flare (veh)						
Median type			None			None
Median storage veh)						
Upstream signal (ft)						
pX, platoon unblocked						
vC, conflicting volume	190	62			66	
vC1, stage 1 conf vol						
vC2, stage 2 conf vol						
vCu, unblocked vol	190	62			66	
tC, single (s)	6.4	6.2			4.1	
tC, 2 stage (s)						
tF (s)	3.5	3.3			2.2	
p0 queue free %	97	94			98	
cM capacity (veh/h)	785	1004			1536	
Direction, Lane #	WB 1	NB 1	SB 1			
Volume Total	90	66	100			
Volume Left	27	0	28			
Volume Right	63	9	0			
cSH	926	1700	1536			
Volume to Capacity	0.10	0.04	0.02			
Queue Length 95th (ft)	8	0	1			
Control Delay (s)	9.3	0.0	2.2			
Lane LOS	A		A			
Approach Delay (s)	9.3	0.0	2.2			
Approach LOS	A					
Intersection Summary						
Average Delay			4.1			
Intersection Capacity Utilization			23.2%	ICU Level of Service		A
Analysis Period (min)			15			

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis 12: Highland Ave & South Garage Ramp

03/15/2019

												
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations												
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	0	0	0	32	0	15	0	45	15	11	80	0
Future Volume (Veh/h)	0	0	0	32	0	15	0	45	15	11	80	0
Sign Control		Stop			Stop			Free			Free	
Grade		0%			0%			0%			0%	
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92
Hourly flow rate (vph)	0	0	0	35	0	16	0	49	16	12	87	0
Pedestrians												
Lane Width (ft)												
Walking Speed (ft/s)												
Percent Blockage												
Right turn flare (veh)												
Median type								None			None	
Median storage (veh)												
Upstream signal (ft)												
pX, platoon unblocked												
vC, conflicting volume	184	176	87	168	168	57	87			65		
vC1, stage 1 conf vol												
vC2, stage 2 conf vol												
vCu, unblocked vol	184	176	87	168	168	57	87			65		
tC, single (s)	7.1	6.5	6.2	7.1	6.5	6.2	4.1			4.1		
tC, 2 stage (s)												
tF (s)	3.5	4.0	3.3	3.5	4.0	3.3	2.2			2.2		
p0 queue free %	100	100	100	96	100	98	100			99		
cM capacity (veh/h)	760	712	971	791	719	1009	1509			1537		
Direction, Lane #	EB 1	WB 1	NB 1	SB 1								
Volume Total	0	51	65	99								
Volume Left	0	35	0	12								
Volume Right	0	16	16	0								
cSH	1700	849	1509	1537								
Volume to Capacity	0.00	0.06	0.00	0.01								
Queue Length 95th (ft)	0	5	0	1								
Control Delay (s)	0.0	9.5	0.0	0.9								
Lane LOS	A	A		A								
Approach Delay (s)	0.0	9.5	0.0	0.9								
Approach LOS	A	A										
Intersection Summary												
Average Delay			2.7									
Intersection Capacity Utilization			21.5%	ICU Level of Service				A				
Analysis Period (min)			15									

Capacity Analysis – Future Conditions

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis

1: Highland Ave & Campbell St

03/15/2019

						
Movement	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	NBL	NBR
Lane Configurations						
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	162	38	23	95	19	58
Future Volume (Veh/h)	162	38	23	95	19	58
Sign Control	Free			Free	Stop	
Grade	0%			0%	0%	
Peak Hour Factor	0.87	0.87	0.87	0.87	0.87	0.87
Hourly flow rate (vph)	186	44	26	109	22	67
Pedestrians	60			60	60	
Lane Width (ft)	12.0			12.0	12.0	
Walking Speed (ft/s)	3.5			3.5	3.5	
Percent Blockage	6			6	6	
Right turn flare (veh)						
Median type	None			None		
Median storage veh						
Upstream signal (ft)						
pX, platoon unblocked						
vC, conflicting volume			290		489	328
vC1, stage 1 conf vol						
vC2, stage 2 conf vol						
vCu, unblocked vol			290		489	328
tC, single (s)			4.1		6.4	6.2
tC, 2 stage (s)						
tF (s)			2.2		3.5	3.3
p0 queue free %			98		95	90
cM capacity (veh/h)			1210		471	638
Direction, Lane #	EB 1	WB 1	NB 1			
Volume Total	230	135	89			
Volume Left	0	26	22			
Volume Right	44	0	67			
cSH	1700	1210	587			
Volume to Capacity	0.14	0.02	0.15			
Queue Length 95th (ft)	0	2	13			
Control Delay (s)	0.0	1.7	12.2			
Lane LOS		A	B			
Approach Delay (s)	0.0	1.7	12.2			
Approach LOS			B			
Intersection Summary						
Average Delay		2.9				
Intersection Capacity Utilization		42.0%		ICU Level of Service		A
Analysis Period (min)		15				

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis

2: Chestnut Ave & Campbell St

03/15/2019

												
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations												
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	14	179	8	8	113	7	15	7	5	7	7	9
Future Volume (Veh/h)	14	179	8	8	113	7	15	7	5	7	7	9
Sign Control		Free			Free			Stop			Stop	
Grade		0%			0%			0%			0%	
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92
Hourly flow rate (vph)	15	195	9	9	123	8	16	8	5	8	8	10
Pedestrians		60			60			60			60	
Lane Width (ft)		12.0			12.0			12.0			12.0	
Walking Speed (ft/s)		3.5			3.5			3.5			3.5	
Percent Blockage		6			6			6			6	
Right turn flare (veh)												
Median type		None			None							
Median storage (veh)												
Upstream signal (ft)												
pX, platoon unblocked												
vC, conflicting volume	191			264			508	498	320	504	499	247
vC1, stage 1 conf vol												
vC2, stage 2 conf vol												
vCu, unblocked vol	191			264			508	498	320	504	499	247
tC, single (s)	4.1			4.1			7.1	6.5	6.2	7.1	6.5	6.2
tC, 2 stage (s)												
tF (s)	2.2			2.2			3.5	4.0	3.3	3.5	4.0	3.3
p0 queue free %	99			99			96	98	99	98	98	99
cM capacity (veh/h)	1304			1226			370	413	641	375	413	704
Direction, Lane #	EB 1	WB 1	NB 1	SB 1								
Volume Total	219	140	29	26								
Volume Left	15	9	16	8								
Volume Right	9	8	5	10								
cSH	1304	1226	412	474								
Volume to Capacity	0.01	0.01	0.07	0.05								
Queue Length 95th (ft)	1	1	6	4								
Control Delay (s)	0.6	0.6	14.4	13.0								
Lane LOS	A	A	B	B								
Approach Delay (s)	0.6	0.6	14.4	13.0								
Approach LOS			B	B								
Intersection Summary												
Average Delay			2.4									
Intersection Capacity Utilization			33.0%		ICU Level of Service				A			
Analysis Period (min)			15									

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis

3: Highland Ave & Sigwalt St

03/15/2019

												
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations												
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	9	213	9	14	125	55	17	20	24	70	17	14
Future Volume (Veh/h)	9	213	9	14	125	55	17	20	24	70	17	14
Sign Control		Free			Free			Stop			Stop	
Grade		0%			0%			0%			0%	
Peak Hour Factor	0.70	0.70	0.70	0.70	0.70	0.70	0.70	0.70	0.70	0.70	0.70	0.70
Hourly flow rate (vph)	13	304	13	20	179	79	24	29	34	100	24	20
Pedestrians		60			60			60			60	
Lane Width (ft)		12.0			12.0			12.0			12.0	
Walking Speed (ft/s)		3.5			3.5			3.5			3.5	
Percent Blockage		6			6			6			6	
Right turn flare (veh)												
Median type		None			None							
Median storage (veh)												
Upstream signal (ft)												
pX, platoon unblocked												
vC, conflicting volume	318			377			747	754	430	764	722	338
vC1, stage 1 conf vol												
vC2, stage 2 conf vol												
vCu, unblocked vol	318			377			747	754	430	764	722	338
tC, single (s)	4.1			4.1			7.1	6.5	6.2	7.1	6.5	6.2
tC, 2 stage (s)												
tF (s)	2.2			2.2			3.5	4.0	3.3	3.5	4.0	3.3
p0 queue free %	99			98			90	90	94	54	92	97
cM capacity (veh/h)	1182			1124			241	294	552	219	307	630
Direction, Lane #	EB 1	WB 1	NB 1	SB 1								
Volume Total	330	278	87	144								
Volume Left	13	20	24	100								
Volume Right	13	79	34	20								
cSH	1182	1124	335	255								
Volume to Capacity	0.01	0.02	0.26	0.57								
Queue Length 95th (ft)	1	1	26	79								
Control Delay (s)	0.4	0.8	19.5	36.1								
Lane LOS	A	A	C	E								
Approach Delay (s)	0.4	0.8	19.5	36.1								
Approach LOS			C	E								
Intersection Summary												
Average Delay			8.6									
Intersection Capacity Utilization			36.9%		ICU Level of Service				A			
Analysis Period (min)			15									

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis

4: Chestnut Ave & Sigwalt St

03/15/2019

												
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations												
Sign Control		Stop			Stop			Stop			Stop	
Traffic Volume (vph)	5	202	4	5	139	12	3	2	6	23	9	7
Future Volume (vph)	5	202	4	5	139	12	3	2	6	23	9	7
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92
Hourly flow rate (vph)	5	220	4	5	151	13	3	2	7	25	10	8
Direction, Lane #	EB 1	WB 1	NB 1	SB 1								
Volume Total (vph)	229	169	12	43								
Volume Left (vph)	5	5	3	25								
Volume Right (vph)	4	13	7	8								
Hadj (s)	0.03	-0.01	-0.27	0.04								
Departure Headway (s)	4.2	4.3	4.6	4.8								
Degree Utilization, x	0.27	0.20	0.02	0.06								
Capacity (veh/h)	832	815	716	680								
Control Delay (s)	8.8	8.3	7.6	8.1								
Approach Delay (s)	8.8	8.3	7.6	8.1								
Approach LOS	A	A	A	A								
Intersection Summary												
Delay				8.5								
Level of Service				A								
Intersection Capacity Utilization				32.2%	ICU Level of Service	A						
Analysis Period (min)				15								

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis

5: Vail Ave & Campbell St

03/15/2019

												
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations												
Sign Control		Stop			Stop			Stop			Stop	
Traffic Volume (vph)	57	117	19	19	60	12	10	65	7	19	89	30
Future Volume (vph)	57	117	19	19	60	12	10	65	7	19	89	30
Peak Hour Factor	0.82	0.82	0.82	0.82	0.82	0.82	0.82	0.82	0.82	0.82	0.82	0.82
Hourly flow rate (vph)	70	143	23	23	73	15	12	79	9	23	109	37
Direction, Lane #	EB 1	EB 2	WB 1	WB 2	NB 1	SB 1	SB 2					
Volume Total (vph)	213	23	96	15	100	132	37					
Volume Left (vph)	70	0	23	0	12	23	0					
Volume Right (vph)	0	23	0	15	9	0	37					
Hadj (s)	0.16	-0.70	0.20	-0.70	0.03	0.20	-0.63					
Departure Headway (s)	5.6	4.7	5.7	4.8	5.7	5.7	4.9					
Degree Utilization, x	0.33	0.03	0.15	0.02	0.16	0.21	0.05					
Capacity (veh/h)	617	726	591	695	593	589	682					
Control Delay (s)	10.0	6.6	8.6	6.7	9.7	9.1	7.0					
Approach Delay (s)	9.7		8.3		9.7	8.6						
Approach LOS	A		A		A	A						
Intersection Summary												
Delay			9.2									
Level of Service			A									
Intersection Capacity Utilization			47.2%	ICU Level of Service					A			
Analysis Period (min)			15									

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis

6: Vail Ave & Sigwalt St

03/15/2019

												
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations												
Sign Control		Stop			Stop			Stop			Stop	
Traffic Volume (vph)	22	278	7	11	177	49	12	55	15	69	40	5
Future Volume (vph)	22	278	7	11	177	49	12	55	15	69	40	5
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92
Hourly flow rate (vph)	24	302	8	12	192	53	13	60	16	75	43	5
Direction, Lane #	EB 1	WB 1	NB 1	SB 1								
Volume Total (vph)	334	257	89	123								
Volume Left (vph)	24	12	13	75								
Volume Right (vph)	8	53	16	5								
Hadj (s)	0.03	-0.08	-0.04	0.13								
Departure Headway (s)	4.9	4.9	5.6	5.7								
Degree Utilization, x	0.45	0.35	0.14	0.19								
Capacity (veh/h)	700	697	565	568								
Control Delay (s)	11.9	10.5	9.4	10.0								
Approach Delay (s)	11.9	10.5	9.4	10.0								
Approach LOS	B	B	A	B								
Intersection Summary												
Delay				10.9								
Level of Service				B								
Intersection Capacity Utilization				43.1%	ICU Level of Service	A						
Analysis Period (min)				15								

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis

7: Ridge Ave & Campbell St

03/15/2019

												
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations												
Sign Control		Stop			Stop			Stop			Stop	
Traffic Volume (vph)	47	139	24	10	84	22	26	124	10	32	168	41
Future Volume (vph)	47	139	24	10	84	22	26	124	10	32	168	41
Peak Hour Factor	0.88	0.88	0.88	0.88	0.88	0.88	0.88	0.88	0.88	0.88	0.88	0.88
Hourly flow rate (vph)	53	158	27	11	95	25	30	141	11	36	191	47
Direction, Lane #	EB 1	WB 1	NB 1	SB 1								
Volume Total (vph)	238	131	182	274								
Volume Left (vph)	53	11	30	36								
Volume Right (vph)	27	25	11	47								
Hadj (s)	0.00	-0.05	0.01	-0.06								
Departure Headway (s)	5.4	5.5	5.4	5.2								
Degree Utilization, x	0.35	0.20	0.27	0.39								
Capacity (veh/h)	621	584	606	650								
Control Delay (s)	11.2	9.9	10.4	11.5								
Approach Delay (s)	11.2	9.9	10.4	11.5								
Approach LOS	B	A	B	B								
Intersection Summary												
Delay				10.9								
Level of Service				B								
Intersection Capacity Utilization				42.6%	ICU Level of Service	A						
Analysis Period (min)				15								

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis 8: Mitchell Ave & Campbell St

03/15/2019

						
Movement	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	NBL	NBR
Lane Configurations						
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	176	3	4	105	9	10
Future Volume (Veh/h)	176	3	4	105	9	10
Sign Control	Free			Free	Stop	
Grade	0%			0%	0%	
Peak Hour Factor	0.84	0.84	0.84	0.84	0.84	0.84
Hourly flow rate (vph)	210	4	5	125	11	12
Pedestrians	60			60	60	
Lane Width (ft)	12.0			12.0	12.0	
Walking Speed (ft/s)	3.5			3.5	3.5	
Percent Blockage	6			6	6	
Right turn flare (veh)						
Median type	None			None		
Median storage veh						
Upstream signal (ft)						
pX, platoon unblocked						
vC, conflicting volume			274		467	332
vC1, stage 1 conf vol						
vC2, stage 2 conf vol						
vCu, unblocked vol			274		467	332
tC, single (s)			4.1		6.4	6.2
tC, 2 stage (s)						
tF (s)			2.2		3.5	3.3
p0 queue free %			100		98	98
cM capacity (veh/h)			1226		494	635
Direction, Lane #	EB 1	WB 1	NB 1			
Volume Total	214	130	23			
Volume Left	0	5	11			
Volume Right	4	0	12			
cSH	1700	1226	559			
Volume to Capacity	0.13	0.00	0.04			
Queue Length 95th (ft)	0	0	3			
Control Delay (s)	0.0	0.3	11.7			
Lane LOS		A	B			
Approach Delay (s)	0.0	0.3	11.7			
Approach LOS			B			
Intersection Summary						
Average Delay		0.9				
Intersection Capacity Utilization		31.5%	ICU Level of Service	A		
Analysis Period (min)		15				

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis

9: Chestnut Ave & Wing St

03/15/2019

						
Movement	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	NBL	NBR
Lane Configurations						
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	27	6	20	34	4	16
Future Volume (Veh/h)	27	6	20	34	4	16
Sign Control	Free			Free	Stop	
Grade	0%			0%	0%	
Peak Hour Factor	0.91	0.91	0.91	0.91	0.91	0.91
Hourly flow rate (vph)	30	7	22	37	4	18
Pedestrians	60			60	60	
Lane Width (ft)	12.0			12.0	12.0	
Walking Speed (ft/s)	3.5			3.5	3.5	
Percent Blockage	6			6	6	
Right turn flare (veh)						
Median type	None			None		
Median storage veh						
Upstream signal (ft)						
pX, platoon unblocked						
vC, conflicting volume			97		234	154
vC1, stage 1 conf vol						
vC2, stage 2 conf vol						
vCu, unblocked vol			97		234	154
tC, single (s)			4.1		6.4	6.3
tC, 2 stage (s)						
tF (s)			2.2		3.5	3.4
p0 queue free %			98		99	98
cM capacity (veh/h)			1423		664	780
Direction, Lane #	EB 1	WB 1	NB 1			
Volume Total	37	59	22			
Volume Left	0	22	4			
Volume Right	7	0	18			
cSH	1700	1423	756			
Volume to Capacity	0.02	0.02	0.03			
Queue Length 95th (ft)	0	1	2			
Control Delay (s)	0.0	2.9	9.9			
Lane LOS		A	A			
Approach Delay (s)	0.0	2.9	9.9			
Approach LOS			A			
Intersection Summary						
Average Delay			3.3			
Intersection Capacity Utilization			30.8%	ICU Level of Service	A	
Analysis Period (min)			15			

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis

10: Dunton Ave & Campbell St

03/15/2019

												
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations												
Sign Control		Stop			Stop			Stop			Stop	
Traffic Volume (vph)	22	97	19	7	47	14	11	58	11	14	75	32
Future Volume (vph)	22	97	19	7	47	14	11	58	11	14	75	32
Peak Hour Factor	0.82	0.82	0.82	0.82	0.82	0.82	0.82	0.82	0.82	0.82	0.82	0.82
Hourly flow rate (vph)	27	118	23	9	57	17	13	71	13	17	91	39
Direction, Lane #	EB 1	WB 1	NB 1	SB 1								
Volume Total (vph)	168	83	97	147								
Volume Left (vph)	27	9	13	17								
Volume Right (vph)	23	17	13	39								
Hadj (s)	-0.04	-0.07	0.02	-0.08								
Departure Headway (s)	4.6	4.6	4.7	4.5								
Degree Utilization, x	0.21	0.11	0.13	0.19								
Capacity (veh/h)	741	722	717	741								
Control Delay (s)	8.8	8.2	8.4	8.6								
Approach Delay (s)	8.8	8.2	8.4	8.6								
Approach LOS	A	A	A	A								
Intersection Summary												
Delay			8.5									
Level of Service			A									
Intersection Capacity Utilization			32.7%		ICU Level of Service				A			
Analysis Period (min)			15									

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis

11: Highland Ave & North Garage Ramp

03/15/2019

									
Movement	WBL	WBR	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT			
Lane Configurations									
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	13	14	82	11	18	36			
Future Volume (Veh/h)	13	14	82	11	18	36			
Sign Control	Stop		Free			Free			
Grade	0%		0%			0%			
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92			
Hourly flow rate (vph)	14	15	89	12	20	39			
Pedestrians	60		60			60			
Lane Width (ft)	12.0		12.0			12.0			
Walking Speed (ft/s)	3.5		3.5			3.5			
Percent Blockage	6		6			6			
Right turn flare (veh)									
Median type			None			None			
Median storage (veh)									
Upstream signal (ft)									
pX, platoon unblocked									
vC, conflicting volume	294	215			161				
vC1, stage 1 conf vol									
vC2, stage 2 conf vol									
vCu, unblocked vol	294	215			161				
tC, single (s)	6.4	6.2			4.1				
tC, 2 stage (s)									
tF (s)	3.5	3.3			2.2				
p0 queue free %	98	98			99				
cM capacity (veh/h)	610	733			1337				
Direction, Lane #	WB 1	NB 1	SB 1						
Volume Total	29	101	59						
Volume Left	14	0	20						
Volume Right	15	12	0						
cSH	668	1700	1337						
Volume to Capacity	0.04	0.06	0.01						
Queue Length 95th (ft)	3	0	1						
Control Delay (s)	10.6	0.0	2.7						
Lane LOS	B		A						
Approach Delay (s)	10.6	0.0	2.7						
Approach LOS	B								
Intersection Summary									
Average Delay		2.5							
Intersection Capacity Utilization		31.0%	ICU Level of Service	A					
Analysis Period (min)		15							

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis12: Highland Ave & South Garage Ramp

03/15/2019

												
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations												
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	18	0	64	9	0	16	15	59	7	5	42	2
Future Volume (Veh/h)	18	0	64	9	0	16	15	59	7	5	42	2
Sign Control		Stop			Stop			Free			Free	
Grade		0%			0%			0%			0%	
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92
Hourly flow rate (vph)	20	0	70	10	0	17	16	64	8	5	46	2
Pedestrians		60			60			60			60	
Lane Width (ft)		12.0			12.0			12.0			12.0	
Walking Speed (ft/s)		3.5			3.5			3.5			3.5	
Percent Blockage		6			6			6			6	
Right turn flare (veh)												
Median type								None			None	
Median storage (veh)												
Upstream signal (ft)												
pX, platoon unblocked												
vC, conflicting volume	294	281	167	347	278	188	108			132		
vC1, stage 1 conf vol												
vC2, stage 2 conf vol												
vCu, unblocked vol	294	281	167	347	278	188	108			132		
tC, single (s)	7.1	6.5	6.2	7.1	6.5	6.2	4.1			4.1		
tC, 2 stage (s)												
tF (s)	3.5	4.0	3.3	3.5	4.0	3.3	2.2			2.2		
p0 queue free %	96	100	91	98	100	98	99			100		
cM capacity (veh/h)	518	549	780	445	552	759	1398			1370		
Direction, Lane #	EB 1	WB 1	NB 1	SB 1								
Volume Total	90	27	88	53								
Volume Left	20	10	16	5								
Volume Right	70	17	8	2								
cSH	701	602	1398	1370								
Volume to Capacity	0.13	0.04	0.01	0.00								
Queue Length 95th (ft)	11	4	1	0								
Control Delay (s)	10.9	11.3	1.5	0.7								
Lane LOS	B	B	A	A								
Approach Delay (s)	10.9	11.3	1.5	0.7								
Approach LOS	B	B										
Intersection Summary												
Average Delay			5.6									
Intersection Capacity Utilization			32.0%		ICU Level of Service				A			
Analysis Period (min)			15									

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis

13: Proposed Access & Campbell St

03/15/2019

						
Movement	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	NBL	NBR
Lane Configurations						
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	187	4	1	121	7	2
Future Volume (Veh/h)	187	4	1	121	7	2
Sign Control	Free			Free	Stop	
Grade	0%			0%	0%	
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92
Hourly flow rate (vph)	203	4	1	132	8	2
Pedestrians	60			60	60	
Lane Width (ft)	12.0			12.0	12.0	
Walking Speed (ft/s)	3.5			3.5	3.5	
Percent Blockage	6			6	6	
Right turn flare (veh)						
Median type	None			None		
Median storage veh)						
Upstream signal (ft)						
pX, platoon unblocked						
vC, conflicting volume			267		459	325
vC1, stage 1 conf vol						
vC2, stage 2 conf vol						
vCu, unblocked vol			267		459	325
tC, single (s)			4.1		6.4	6.2
tC, 2 stage (s)						
tF (s)			2.2		3.5	3.3
p0 queue free %			100		98	100
cM capacity (veh/h)			1223		498	637
Direction, Lane #	EB 1	WB 1	NB 1			
Volume Total	207	133	10			
Volume Left	0	1	8			
Volume Right	4	0	2			
cSH	1700	1223	520			
Volume to Capacity	0.12	0.00	0.02			
Queue Length 95th (ft)	0	0	1			
Control Delay (s)	0.0	0.1	12.1			
Lane LOS		A	B			
Approach Delay (s)	0.0	0.1	12.1			
Approach LOS			B			
Intersection Summary						
Average Delay	0.4					
Intersection Capacity Utilization	31.6%			ICU Level of Service	A	
Analysis Period (min)	15					

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis

14: Chestnut Ave & Exit Access

03/15/2019

						
Movement	WBL	WBR	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT
Lane Configurations						
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	0	8	19	0	0	23
Future Volume (Veh/h)	0	8	19	0	0	23
Sign Control	Stop		Free			Free
Grade	0%		0%			0%
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92
Hourly flow rate (vph)	0	9	21	0	0	25
Pedestrians	60		60			60
Lane Width (ft)	12.0		12.0			12.0
Walking Speed (ft/s)	3.5		3.5			3.5
Percent Blockage	6		6			6
Right turn flare (veh)						
Median type			None			None
Median storage veh						
Upstream signal (ft)						
pX, platoon unblocked						
vC, conflicting volume	166	141			81	
vC1, stage 1 conf vol						
vC2, stage 2 conf vol						
vCu, unblocked vol	166	141			81	
tC, single (s)	6.4	6.2			4.1	
tC, 2 stage (s)						
tF (s)	3.5	3.3			2.2	
p0 queue free %	100	99			100	
cM capacity (veh/h)	733	806			1430	
Direction, Lane #	WB 1	NB 1	SB 1			
Volume Total	9	21	25			
Volume Left	0	0	0			
Volume Right	9	0	0			
cSH	806	1700	1700			
Volume to Capacity	0.01	0.01	0.01			
Queue Length 95th (ft)	1	0	0			
Control Delay (s)	9.5	0.0	0.0			
Lane LOS	A					
Approach Delay (s)	9.5	0.0	0.0			
Approach LOS	A					
Intersection Summary						
Average Delay		1.6				
Intersection Capacity Utilization		30.8%		ICU Level of Service		A
Analysis Period (min)		15				

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis 15: Chestnut Ave & 33 S Chestnut Access

03/15/2019

						
Movement	WBL	WBR	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT
Lane Configurations						
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	13	6	16	3	2	26
Future Volume (Veh/h)	13	6	16	3	2	26
Sign Control	Stop		Free			Free
Grade	0%		0%			0%
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92
Hourly flow rate (vph)	14	7	17	3	2	28
Pedestrians	60		60			60
Lane Width (ft)	12.0		12.0			12.0
Walking Speed (ft/s)	3.5		3.5			3.5
Percent Blockage	6		6			6
Right turn flare (veh)						
Median type			None			None
Median storage (veh)						
Upstream signal (ft)						
pX, platoon unblocked						
vC, conflicting volume	170	138			80	
vC1, stage 1 conf vol						
vC2, stage 2 conf vol						
vCu, unblocked vol	170	138			80	
tC, single (s)	6.4	6.2			4.1	
tC, 2 stage (s)						
tF (s)	3.5	3.3			2.2	
p0 queue free %	98	99			100	
cM capacity (veh/h)	728	809			1431	
Direction, Lane #	WB 1	NB 1	SB 1			
Volume Total	21	20	30			
Volume Left	14	0	2			
Volume Right	7	3	0			
cSH	753	1700	1431			
Volume to Capacity	0.03	0.01	0.00			
Queue Length 95th (ft)	2	0	0			
Control Delay (s)	9.9	0.0	0.5			
Lane LOS	A		A			
Approach Delay (s)	9.9	0.0	0.5			
Approach LOS	A					
Intersection Summary						
Average Delay		3.1				
Intersection Capacity Utilization		30.6%		ICU Level of Service		A
Analysis Period (min)		15				

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis

1: Highland Ave & Campbell St

03/15/2019

						
Movement	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	NBL	NBR
Lane Configurations						
Sign Control	Stop			Stop	Stop	
Traffic Volume (vph)	162	38	23	95	19	58
Future Volume (vph)	162	38	23	95	19	58
Peak Hour Factor	0.87	0.87	0.87	0.87	0.87	0.87
Hourly flow rate (vph)	186	44	26	109	22	67
Direction, Lane #	EB 1	WB 1	NB 1			
Volume Total (vph)	230	135	89			
Volume Left (vph)	0	26	22			
Volume Right (vph)	44	0	67			
Hadj (s)	-0.11	0.12	-0.40			
Departure Headway (s)	4.1	4.5	4.3			
Degree Utilization, x	0.26	0.17	0.11			
Capacity (veh/h)	846	775	772			
Control Delay (s)	8.6	8.4	7.8			
Approach Delay (s)	8.6	8.4	7.8			
Approach LOS	A	A	A			
Intersection Summary						
Delay			8.4			
Level of Service			A			
Intersection Capacity Utilization			41.5%	ICU Level of Service	A	
Analysis Period (min)			15			

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis

3: Highland Ave & Sigwalt St

03/15/2019

												
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations												
Sign Control		Stop			Stop			Stop			Stop	
Traffic Volume (vph)	9	213	9	14	125	55	17	20	24	70	17	14
Future Volume (vph)	9	213	9	14	125	55	17	20	24	70	17	14
Peak Hour Factor	0.70	0.70	0.70	0.70	0.70	0.70	0.70	0.70	0.70	0.70	0.70	0.70
Hourly flow rate (vph)	13	304	13	20	179	79	24	29	34	100	24	20
Direction, Lane #	EB 1	WB 1	NB 1	SB 1								
Volume Total (vph)	330	278	87	144								
Volume Left (vph)	13	20	24	100								
Volume Right (vph)	13	79	34	20								
Hadj (s)	0.02	-0.15	-0.15	0.11								
Departure Headway (s)	5.0	4.9	5.5	5.7								
Degree Utilization, x	0.46	0.38	0.13	0.23								
Capacity (veh/h)	688	694	559	565								
Control Delay (s)	12.1	10.8	9.4	10.4								
Approach Delay (s)	12.1	10.8	9.4	10.4								
Approach LOS	B	B	A	B								
Intersection Summary												
Delay			11.1									
Level of Service			B									
Intersection Capacity Utilization			36.9%	ICU Level of Service				A				
Analysis Period (min)			15									

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis

1: Highland Ave & Campbell St

03/15/2019

	→	↘	↙	←	↖	↗
Movement	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	NBL	NBR
Lane Configurations	↱			↱	↘↙	
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	172	64	83	165	44	80
Future Volume (Veh/h)	172	64	83	165	44	80
Sign Control	Free			Free	Stop	
Grade	0%			0%	0%	
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92
Hourly flow rate (vph)	187	70	90	179	48	87
Pedestrians	60			60	60	
Lane Width (ft)	12.0			12.0	12.0	
Walking Speed (ft/s)	3.5			3.5	3.5	
Percent Blockage	6			6	6	
Right turn flare (veh)						
Median type	None			None		
Median storage veh)						
Upstream signal (ft)						
pX, platoon unblocked						
vC, conflicting volume			317		701	342
vC1, stage 1 conf vol						
vC2, stage 2 conf vol						
vCu, unblocked vol			317		701	342
tC, single (s)			4.1		6.4	6.2
tC, 2 stage (s)						
tF (s)			2.2		3.5	3.3
p0 queue free %			92		86	86
cM capacity (veh/h)			1172		332	623
Direction, Lane #	EB 1	WB 1	NB 1			
Volume Total	257	269	135			
Volume Left	0	90	48			
Volume Right	70	0	87			
cSH	1700	1172	475			
Volume to Capacity	0.15	0.08	0.28			
Queue Length 95th (ft)	0	6	29			
Control Delay (s)	0.0	3.3	15.6			
Lane LOS		A	C			
Approach Delay (s)	0.0	3.3	15.6			
Approach LOS			C			
Intersection Summary						
Average Delay			4.5			
Intersection Capacity Utilization			50.4%	ICU Level of Service	A	
Analysis Period (min)			15			

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis

2: Chestnut Ave & Campbell St

03/15/2019

												
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations												
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	35	197	16	34	135	41	16	11	9	14	16	31
Future Volume (Veh/h)	35	197	16	34	135	41	16	11	9	14	16	31
Sign Control		Free			Free			Stop			Stop	
Grade		0%			0%			0%			0%	
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92
Hourly flow rate (vph)	38	214	17	37	147	45	17	12	10	15	17	34
Pedestrians		60			60			60			60	
Lane Width (ft)		12.0			12.0			12.0			12.0	
Walking Speed (ft/s)		3.5			3.5			3.5			3.5	
Percent Blockage		6			6			6			6	
Right turn flare (veh)												
Median type		None			None							
Median storage (veh)												
Upstream signal (ft)												
pX, platoon unblocked												
vC, conflicting volume	252			291			704	684	342	678	670	290
vC1, stage 1 conf vol												
vC2, stage 2 conf vol												
vCu, unblocked vol	252			291			704	684	342	678	670	290
tC, single (s)	4.1			4.1			7.1	6.5	6.2	7.1	6.5	6.2
tC, 2 stage (s)												
tF (s)	2.2			2.2			3.5	4.0	3.3	3.5	4.0	3.3
p0 queue free %	97			97			93	96	98	94	95	95
cM capacity (veh/h)	1238			1198			249	310	622	272	316	666
Direction, Lane #	EB 1	WB 1	NB 1	SB 1								
Volume Total	269	229	39	66								
Volume Left	38	37	17	15								
Volume Right	17	45	10	34								
cSH	1238	1198	317	412								
Volume to Capacity	0.03	0.03	0.12	0.16								
Queue Length 95th (ft)	2	2	10	14								
Control Delay (s)	1.4	1.5	18.0	15.4								
Lane LOS	A	A	C	C								
Approach Delay (s)	1.4	1.5	18.0	15.4								
Approach LOS			C	C								
Intersection Summary												
Average Delay			4.0									
Intersection Capacity Utilization			36.4%		ICU Level of Service				A			
Analysis Period (min)			15									

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis

3: Highland Ave & Sigwalt St

03/15/2019

												
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations												
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	22	134	14	14	162	132	8	38	20	97	43	40
Future Volume (Veh/h)	22	134	14	14	162	132	8	38	20	97	43	40
Sign Control		Free			Free			Stop			Stop	
Grade		0%			0%			0%			0%	
Peak Hour Factor	0.89	0.89	0.89	0.89	0.89	0.89	0.89	0.89	0.89	0.89	0.89	0.89
Hourly flow rate (vph)	25	151	16	16	182	148	9	43	22	109	48	45
Pedestrians		60			60			60			60	
Lane Width (ft)		12.0			12.0			12.0			12.0	
Walking Speed (ft/s)		3.5			3.5			3.5			3.5	
Percent Blockage		6			6			6			6	
Right turn flare (veh)												
Median type		None			None							
Median storage (veh)												
Upstream signal (ft)												
pX, platoon unblocked												
vC, conflicting volume	390			227			686	691	279	660	625	376
vC1, stage 1 conf vol												
vC2, stage 2 conf vol												
vCu, unblocked vol	390			227			686	691	279	660	625	376
tC, single (s)	4.1			4.1			7.1	6.5	6.2	7.1	6.5	6.2
tC, 2 stage (s)												
tF (s)	2.2			2.2			3.5	4.0	3.3	3.5	4.0	3.3
p0 queue free %	98			99			96	86	97	58	86	92
cM capacity (veh/h)	1102			1265			237	315	675	259	344	596
Direction, Lane #	EB 1	WB 1	NB 1	SB 1								
Volume Total	192	346	74	202								
Volume Left	25	16	9	109								
Volume Right	16	148	22	45								
cSH	1102	1265	358	318								
Volume to Capacity	0.02	0.01	0.21	0.64								
Queue Length 95th (ft)	2	1	19	102								
Control Delay (s)	1.3	0.5	17.7	34.2								
Lane LOS	A	A	C	D								
Approach Delay (s)	1.3	0.5	17.7	34.2								
Approach LOS			C	D								
Intersection Summary												
Average Delay			10.6									
Intersection Capacity Utilization			45.5%		ICU Level of Service				A			
Analysis Period (min)			15									

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis

4: Chestnut Ave & Sigwalt St

03/15/2019

												
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations												
Sign Control		Stop			Stop			Stop			Stop	
Traffic Volume (vph)	11	128	3	6	165	39	4	4	5	37	8	14
Future Volume (vph)	11	128	3	6	165	39	4	4	5	37	8	14
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92
Hourly flow rate (vph)	12	139	3	7	179	42	4	4	5	40	9	15
Direction, Lane #	EB 1	WB 1	NB 1	SB 1								
Volume Total (vph)	154	228	13	64								
Volume Left (vph)	12	7	4	40								
Volume Right (vph)	3	42	5	15								
Hadj (s)	0.04	-0.07	-0.14	0.02								
Departure Headway (s)	4.4	4.2	4.7	4.8								
Degree Utilization, x	0.19	0.27	0.02	0.08								
Capacity (veh/h)	801	831	698	690								
Control Delay (s)	8.4	8.7	7.8	8.2								
Approach Delay (s)	8.4	8.7	7.8	8.2								
Approach LOS	A	A	A	A								
Intersection Summary												
Delay			8.5									
Level of Service			A									
Intersection Capacity Utilization			32.6%		ICU Level of Service				A			
Analysis Period (min)			15									

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis

5: Vail Ave & Campbell St

03/15/2019

												
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations												
Sign Control		Stop			Stop			Stop			Stop	
Traffic Volume (vph)	68	117	54	43	152	46	33	94	34	36	151	80
Future Volume (vph)	68	117	54	43	152	46	33	94	34	36	151	80
Peak Hour Factor	0.89	0.89	0.89	0.89	0.89	0.89	0.89	0.89	0.89	0.89	0.89	0.89
Hourly flow rate (vph)	76	131	61	48	171	52	37	106	38	40	170	90
Direction, Lane #	EB 1	EB 2	WB 1	WB 2	NB 1	SB 1	SB 2					
Volume Total (vph)	207	61	219	52	181	210	90					
Volume Left (vph)	76	0	48	0	37	40	0					
Volume Right (vph)	0	61	0	52	38	0	90					
Hadj (s)	0.22	-0.67	0.14	-0.67	-0.05	0.13	-0.67					
Departure Headway (s)	6.7	5.8	6.6	5.8	6.5	6.5	5.7					
Degree Utilization, x	0.38	0.10	0.40	0.08	0.33	0.38	0.14					
Capacity (veh/h)	508	579	515	579	506	516	580					
Control Delay (s)	12.5	8.2	12.7	8.1	12.7	12.3	8.5					
Approach Delay (s)	11.5		11.8		12.7	11.2						
Approach LOS	B		B		B	B						
Intersection Summary												
Delay			11.7									
Level of Service			B									
Intersection Capacity Utilization			64.9%	ICU Level of Service				C				
Analysis Period (min)			15									

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis

6: Vail Ave & Sigwalt St

03/15/2019

												
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations												
Sign Control		Stop			Stop			Stop			Stop	
Traffic Volume (vph)	24	222	5	16	252	102	16	65	19	81	45	40
Future Volume (vph)	24	222	5	16	252	102	16	65	19	81	45	40
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92
Hourly flow rate (vph)	26	241	5	17	274	111	17	71	21	88	49	43
Direction, Lane #	EB 1	WB 1	NB 1	SB 1								
Volume Total (vph)	272	402	109	180								
Volume Left (vph)	26	17	17	88								
Volume Right (vph)	5	111	21	43								
Hadj (s)	0.04	-0.12	-0.05	-0.01								
Departure Headway (s)	5.4	5.1	6.0	5.9								
Degree Utilization, x	0.41	0.57	0.18	0.29								
Capacity (veh/h)	617	674	511	543								
Control Delay (s)	12.2	14.6	10.3	11.3								
Approach Delay (s)	12.2	14.6	10.3	11.3								
Approach LOS	B	B	B	B								
Intersection Summary												
Delay			12.8									
Level of Service			B									
Intersection Capacity Utilization			48.0%	ICU Level of Service					A			
Analysis Period (min)			15									

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis

7: Ridge Ave & Campbell St

03/15/2019

												
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations												
Sign Control		Stop			Stop			Stop			Stop	
Traffic Volume (vph)	77	149	35	12	127	30	32	185	12	28	128	63
Future Volume (vph)	77	149	35	12	127	30	32	185	12	28	128	63
Peak Hour Factor	0.91	0.91	0.91	0.91	0.91	0.91	0.91	0.91	0.91	0.91	0.91	0.91
Hourly flow rate (vph)	85	164	38	13	140	33	35	203	13	31	141	69
Direction, Lane #	EB 1	WB 1	NB 1	SB 1								
Volume Total (vph)	287	186	251	241								
Volume Left (vph)	85	13	35	31								
Volume Right (vph)	38	33	13	69								
Hadj (s)	0.01	-0.06	0.03	-0.11								
Departure Headway (s)	5.7	5.8	5.8	5.7								
Degree Utilization, x	0.45	0.30	0.40	0.38								
Capacity (veh/h)	583	549	566	577								
Control Delay (s)	13.4	11.3	12.6	12.1								
Approach Delay (s)	13.4	11.3	12.6	12.1								
Approach LOS	B	B	B	B								
Intersection Summary												
Delay			12.5									
Level of Service			B									
Intersection Capacity Utilization			54.8%	ICU Level of Service					A			
Analysis Period (min)			15									

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis 8: Mitchell Ave & Campbell St

03/15/2019

						
Movement	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	NBL	NBR
Lane Configurations						
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	196	6	9	159	4	9
Future Volume (Veh/h)	196	6	9	159	4	9
Sign Control	Free			Free	Stop	
Grade	0%			0%	0%	
Peak Hour Factor	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93
Hourly flow rate (vph)	211	6	10	171	4	10
Pedestrians	60			60	60	
Lane Width (ft)	12.0			12.0	12.0	
Walking Speed (ft/s)	3.5			3.5	3.5	
Percent Blockage	6			6	6	
Right turn flare (veh)						
Median type	None			None		
Median storage veh						
Upstream signal (ft)						
pX, platoon unblocked						
vC, conflicting volume			277		525	334
vC1, stage 1 conf vol						
vC2, stage 2 conf vol						
vCu, unblocked vol			277		525	334
tC, single (s)			4.1		6.4	6.2
tC, 2 stage (s)						
tF (s)			2.2		3.5	3.3
p0 queue free %			99		99	98
cM capacity (veh/h)			1212		452	629
Direction, Lane #	EB 1	WB 1	NB 1			
Volume Total	217	181	14			
Volume Left	0	10	4			
Volume Right	6	0	10			
cSH	1700	1212	566			
Volume to Capacity	0.13	0.01	0.02			
Queue Length 95th (ft)	0	1	2			
Control Delay (s)	0.0	0.5	11.5			
Lane LOS		A	B			
Approach Delay (s)	0.0	0.5	11.5			
Approach LOS			B			
Intersection Summary						
Average Delay			0.6			
Intersection Capacity Utilization			34.4%	ICU Level of Service	A	
Analysis Period (min)			15			

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis 9: Chestnut Ave & Wing St

03/15/2019

						
Movement	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	NBL	NBR
Lane Configurations						
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	69	4	49	81	8	75
Future Volume (Veh/h)	69	4	49	81	8	75
Sign Control	Free			Free	Stop	
Grade	0%			0%	0%	
Peak Hour Factor	0.84	0.84	0.84	0.84	0.84	0.84
Hourly flow rate (vph)	82	5	58	96	10	89
Pedestrians	60			60	60	
Lane Width (ft)	12.0			12.0	12.0	
Walking Speed (ft/s)	3.5			3.5	3.5	
Percent Blockage	6			6	6	
Right turn flare (veh)						
Median type	None			None		
Median storage veh)						
Upstream signal (ft)						
pX, platoon unblocked						
vC, conflicting volume				147	416	204
vC1, stage 1 conf vol						
vC2, stage 2 conf vol						
vCu, unblocked vol				147	416	204
tC, single (s)				4.1	6.4	6.2
tC, 2 stage (s)						
tF (s)				2.2	3.5	3.3
p0 queue free %				96	98	88
cM capacity (veh/h)				1353	504	743
Direction, Lane #	EB 1	WB 1	NB 1			
Volume Total	87	154	99			
Volume Left	0	58	10			
Volume Right	5	0	89			
cSH	1700	1353	709			
Volume to Capacity	0.05	0.04	0.14			
Queue Length 95th (ft)	0	3	12			
Control Delay (s)	0.0	3.2	10.9			
Lane LOS		A	B			
Approach Delay (s)	0.0	3.2	10.9			
Approach LOS			B			
Intersection Summary						
Average Delay				4.6		
Intersection Capacity Utilization				33.1%	ICU Level of Service	A
Analysis Period (min)				15		

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis

10: Dunton Ave & Campbell St

03/15/2019

												
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations												
Sign Control		Stop			Stop			Stop			Stop	
Traffic Volume (vph)	33	101	31	21	124	37	44	131	26	29	111	46
Future Volume (vph)	33	101	31	21	124	37	44	131	26	29	111	46
Peak Hour Factor	0.88	0.88	0.88	0.88	0.88	0.88	0.88	0.88	0.88	0.88	0.88	0.88
Hourly flow rate (vph)	38	115	35	24	141	42	50	149	30	33	126	52
Direction, Lane #	EB 1	WB 1	NB 1	SB 1								
Volume Total (vph)	188	207	229	211								
Volume Left (vph)	38	24	50	33								
Volume Right (vph)	35	42	30	52								
Hadj (s)	-0.04	-0.06	0.00	-0.08								
Departure Headway (s)	5.4	5.4	5.3	5.3								
Degree Utilization, x	0.28	0.31	0.34	0.31								
Capacity (veh/h)	604	614	616	624								
Control Delay (s)	10.5	10.7	11.1	10.7								
Approach Delay (s)	10.5	10.7	11.1	10.7								
Approach LOS	B	B	B	B								
Intersection Summary												
Delay				10.8								
Level of Service				B								
Intersection Capacity Utilization				39.4%	ICU Level of Service	A						
Analysis Period (min)				15								

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis

11: Highland Ave & North Garage Ramp

03/15/2019

						
Movement	WBL	WBR	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT
Lane Configurations						
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	26	60	140	9	27	98
Future Volume (Veh/h)	26	60	140	9	27	98
Sign Control	Stop		Free			Free
Grade	0%		0%			0%
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92
Hourly flow rate (vph)	28	65	152	10	29	107
Pedestrians	60		60			60
Lane Width (ft)	12.0		12.0			12.0
Walking Speed (ft/s)	3.5		3.5			3.5
Percent Blockage	6		6			6
Right turn flare (veh)						
Median type			None			None
Median storage veh)						
Upstream signal (ft)						
pX, platoon unblocked						
vC, conflicting volume	442	277			222	
vC1, stage 1 conf vol						
vC2, stage 2 conf vol						
vCu, unblocked vol	442	277			222	
tC, single (s)	6.4	6.2			4.1	
tC, 2 stage (s)						
tF (s)	3.5	3.3			2.2	
p0 queue free %	94	90			98	
cM capacity (veh/h)	498	677			1270	
Direction, Lane #	WB 1	NB 1	SB 1			
Volume Total	93	162	136			
Volume Left	28	0	29			
Volume Right	65	10	0			
cSH	611	1700	1270			
Volume to Capacity	0.15	0.10	0.02			
Queue Length 95th (ft)	13	0	2			
Control Delay (s)	11.9	0.0	1.8			
Lane LOS	B		A			
Approach Delay (s)	11.9	0.0	1.8			
Approach LOS	B					
Intersection Summary						
Average Delay		3.5				
Intersection Capacity Utilization		41.9%		ICU Level of Service		A
Analysis Period (min)		15				

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis

12: Highland Ave & South Garage Ramp

03/15/2019

												
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations												
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	11	0	40	33	0	16	44	122	16	12	106	6
Future Volume (Veh/h)	11	0	40	33	0	16	44	122	16	12	106	6
Sign Control		Stop			Stop			Free			Free	
Grade		0%			0%			0%			0%	
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92
Hourly flow rate (vph)	12	0	43	36	0	17	48	133	17	13	115	7
Pedestrians		60			60			60			60	
Lane Width (ft)		12.0			12.0			12.0			12.0	
Walking Speed (ft/s)		3.5			3.5			3.5			3.5	
Percent Blockage		6			6			6			6	
Right turn flare (veh)												
Median type								None			None	
Median storage (veh)												
Upstream signal (ft)												
pX, platoon unblocked												
vC, conflicting volume	519	510	238	545	506	262	182			210		
vC1, stage 1 conf vol												
vC2, stage 2 conf vol												
vCu, unblocked vol	519	510	238	545	506	262	182			210		
tC, single (s)	7.1	6.5	6.2	7.1	6.5	6.2	4.1			4.1		
tC, 2 stage (s)												
tF (s)	3.5	4.0	3.3	3.5	4.0	3.3	2.2			2.2		
p0 queue free %	97	100	94	89	100	98	96			99		
cM capacity (veh/h)	358	395	712	331	398	691	1314			1283		
Direction, Lane #	EB 1	WB 1	NB 1	SB 1								
Volume Total	55	53	198	135								
Volume Left	12	36	48	13								
Volume Right	43	17	17	7								
cSH	585	398	1314	1283								
Volume to Capacity	0.09	0.13	0.04	0.01								
Queue Length 95th (ft)	8	11	3	1								
Control Delay (s)	11.8	15.4	2.1	0.8								
Lane LOS	B	C	A	A								
Approach Delay (s)	11.8	15.4	2.1	0.8								
Approach LOS	B	C										
Intersection Summary												
Average Delay			4.5									
Intersection Capacity Utilization			36.3%		ICU Level of Service					A		
Analysis Period (min)			15									

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis 13: Proposed Access & Campbell St

03/15/2019

						
Movement	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	NBL	NBR
Lane Configurations						
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	203	17	8	191	19	36
Future Volume (Veh/h)	203	17	8	191	19	36
Sign Control	Free			Free	Stop	
Grade	0%			0%	0%	
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92
Hourly flow rate (vph)	221	18	9	208	21	39
Pedestrians	60			60	60	
Lane Width (ft)	12.0			12.0	12.0	
Walking Speed (ft/s)	3.5			3.5	3.5	
Percent Blockage	6			6	6	
Right turn flare (veh)						
Median type	None			None		
Median storage veh						
Upstream signal (ft)						
pX, platoon unblocked						
vC, conflicting volume			299		576	350
vC1, stage 1 conf vol						
vC2, stage 2 conf vol						
vCu, unblocked vol			299		576	350
tC, single (s)			4.1		6.4	6.2
tC, 2 stage (s)						
tF (s)			2.2		3.5	3.3
p0 queue free %			99		95	94
cM capacity (veh/h)			1190		423	616
Direction, Lane #	EB 1	WB 1	NB 1			
Volume Total	239	217	60			
Volume Left	0	9	21			
Volume Right	18	0	39			
cSH	1700	1190	531			
Volume to Capacity	0.14	0.01	0.11			
Queue Length 95th (ft)	0	1	9			
Control Delay (s)	0.0	0.4	12.6			
Lane LOS		A	B			
Approach Delay (s)	0.0	0.4	12.6			
Approach LOS			B			
Intersection Summary						
Average Delay			1.6			
Intersection Capacity Utilization			35.6%	ICU Level of Service		A
Analysis Period (min)			15			

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis

14: Chestnut Ave & Exit Access

03/15/2019

						
Movement	WBL	WBR	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT
Lane Configurations						
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	0	9	45	0	0	59
Future Volume (Veh/h)	0	9	45	0	0	59
Sign Control	Stop		Free			Free
Grade	0%		0%			0%
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92
Hourly flow rate (vph)	0	10	49	0	0	64
Pedestrians	60		60			60
Lane Width (ft)	12.0		12.0			12.0
Walking Speed (ft/s)	3.5		3.5			3.5
Percent Blockage	6		6			6
Right turn flare (veh)						
Median type			None			None
Median storage (veh)						
Upstream signal (ft)						
pX, platoon unblocked						
vC, conflicting volume	233	169			109	
vC1, stage 1 conf vol						
vC2, stage 2 conf vol						
vCu, unblocked vol	233	169			109	
tC, single (s)	6.4	6.2			4.1	
tC, 2 stage (s)						
tF (s)	3.5	3.3			2.2	
p0 queue free %	100	99			100	
cM capacity (veh/h)	671	778			1397	
Direction, Lane #	WB 1	NB 1	SB 1			
Volume Total	10	49	64			
Volume Left	0	0	0			
Volume Right	10	0	0			
cSH	778	1700	1700			
Volume to Capacity	0.01	0.03	0.04			
Queue Length 95th (ft)	1	0	0			
Control Delay (s)	9.7	0.0	0.0			
Lane LOS	A					
Approach Delay (s)	9.7	0.0	0.0			
Approach LOS	A					
Intersection Summary						
Average Delay		0.8				
Intersection Capacity Utilization		30.9%		ICU Level of Service		A
Analysis Period (min)		15				

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis 15: Chestnut Ave & 33 S Chestnut Access

03/15/2019

						
Movement	WBL	WBR	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT
Lane Configurations						
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	6	4	41	13	6	53
Future Volume (Veh/h)	6	4	41	13	6	53
Sign Control	Stop		Free			Free
Grade	0%		0%			0%
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92
Hourly flow rate (vph)	7	4	45	14	7	58
Pedestrians	60		60			60
Lane Width (ft)	12.0		12.0			12.0
Walking Speed (ft/s)	3.5		3.5			3.5
Percent Blockage	6		6			6
Right turn flare (veh)						
Median type			None			None
Median storage veh)						
Upstream signal (ft)						
pX, platoon unblocked						
vC, conflicting volume	244	172			119	
vC1, stage 1 conf vol						
vC2, stage 2 conf vol						
vCu, unblocked vol	244	172			119	
tC, single (s)	6.4	6.2			4.1	
tC, 2 stage (s)						
tF (s)	3.5	3.3			2.2	
p0 queue free %	99	99			99	
cM capacity (veh/h)	658	775			1385	
Direction, Lane #	WB 1	NB 1	SB 1			
Volume Total	11	59	65			
Volume Left	7	0	7			
Volume Right	4	14	0			
cSH	696	1700	1385			
Volume to Capacity	0.02	0.03	0.01			
Queue Length 95th (ft)	1	0	0			
Control Delay (s)	10.3	0.0	0.9			
Lane LOS	B		A			
Approach Delay (s)	10.3	0.0	0.9			
Approach LOS	B					
Intersection Summary						
Average Delay			1.2			
Intersection Capacity Utilization			30.7%	ICU Level of Service		A
Analysis Period (min)			15			

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis

1: Highland Ave & Campbell St

03/15/2019

						
Movement	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	NBL	NBR
Lane Configurations						
Sign Control	Stop			Stop	Stop	
Traffic Volume (vph)	172	64	83	165	44	80
Future Volume (vph)	172	64	83	165	44	80
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92
Hourly flow rate (vph)	187	70	90	179	48	87
Direction, Lane #	EB 1	WB 1	NB 1			
Volume Total (vph)	257	269	135			
Volume Left (vph)	0	90	48			
Volume Right (vph)	70	0	87			
Hadj (s)	-0.13	0.10	-0.28			
Departure Headway (s)	4.4	4.6	4.8			
Degree Utilization, x	0.32	0.35	0.18			
Capacity (veh/h)	783	745	682			
Control Delay (s)	9.5	10.1	8.9			
Approach Delay (s)	9.5	10.1	8.9			
Approach LOS	A	B	A			
Intersection Summary						
Delay			9.6			
Level of Service			A			
Intersection Capacity Utilization			50.4%	ICU Level of Service	A	
Analysis Period (min)			15			

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis

3: Highland Ave & Sigwalt St

03/15/2019

												
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations												
Sign Control		Stop			Stop			Stop			Stop	
Traffic Volume (vph)	22	134	14	14	162	132	8	38	20	97	43	40
Future Volume (vph)	22	134	14	14	162	132	8	38	20	97	43	40
Peak Hour Factor	0.89	0.89	0.89	0.89	0.89	0.89	0.89	0.89	0.89	0.89	0.89	0.89
Hourly flow rate (vph)	25	151	16	16	182	148	9	43	22	109	48	45
Direction, Lane #	EB 1	WB 1	NB 1	SB 1								
Volume Total (vph)	192	346	74	202								
Volume Left (vph)	25	16	9	109								
Volume Right (vph)	16	148	22	45								
Hadj (s)	0.01	-0.21	-0.12	0.01								
Departure Headway (s)	5.2	4.7	5.5	5.4								
Degree Utilization, x	0.28	0.46	0.11	0.30								
Capacity (veh/h)	646	721	565	611								
Control Delay (s)	10.1	11.7	9.2	10.7								
Approach Delay (s)	10.1	11.7	9.2	10.7								
Approach LOS	B	B	A	B								
Intersection Summary												
Delay				10.8								
Level of Service				B								
Intersection Capacity Utilization				45.5%	ICU Level of Service	A						
Analysis Period (min)				15								

ARLINGTON 425

ARLINGTON 42
VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS
COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS
PROJECT NO:3514.02

CCH, L.L.C.
7458 N. HARLEM AVE.
CHICAGO, IL 60631
PH: 773-775-5400
FAX: 773-775-4433

TINAGLIA ARCHITECTS, INC.
814 W. NORTHWEST HIGHWAY
ARLINGTON HEIGHTS, IL 60004
PH: 847-253-0002

COUNTY COOK
CITY, TOWNSHIP VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS, WHEELING TOWNSHIP
SEC. & 1/4 SEC. NO. SE 1/4 OF SEC. 30, T42N, R11E

ELEVATION:

**ARLINGTON 425
DEVELOPMENT**




95/5 W. Higgins Road, Suite /00, Rosemont, Illinois 60018
Phone: (847) 696-4060 Fax: (847) 696-4065

[illegible]

LOCATION MAP

[illegible]

SITE DEVELOPMENT ENGINEERS
LAND SURVEYORS



PACECO INC.

LENAM: 514.02P-TITLE



DATE: 9/21/18

DB NO.
514.02

HEET

B. CC

1 OF 5





BENCHMARK
ELEVATION = 693.47'
DESCRIPTION: " " MARKER X ON NORTHEAST PART OF FLANGE IN BETWEEN BOLTS OF THE FIRE HYDRANT AT THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF HIGHLAND & SIGNAL STREETS.

LEGEND			
	STORM SEWER		SANITARY MANHOLE
	SANITARY SEWER		STORM MANHOLE
	COMBINED SEWER		CATCH BASIN
	WATER MAIN		INLET
	GAS MAIN		FLARED END SECTION
	UNDERGROUND TELEPHONE LINE		ELECTRIC MANHOLE
	UNDERGROUND ELECTRIC LINE		TELEPHONE MANHOLE
	CATV		ELECTRIC UPRIGHT
	OVERHEAD WIRE ON UTILITY POLES		CABLE TV UPRIGHT
	FIBER OPTIC LINE		FIRE HYDRANT
	FENCE		VALVE AND VAULT
	GUARDRAIL		WATER VALVE
	EDGE OF WATER		B BOX
	WETLAND LIMITS		WELL
			AUXILIARY VALVE
			GAS VALVE
			HAND HOLE
			STREET LIGHT
			UTILITY POLE
			TRAFFIC SIGNAL
			SPRINKLER HEAD
			MAILBOX
			SIGN
			UNIDENTIFIED MANHOLE
			SPOT ELEVATION
			RIGHT-OF-WAY MONUMENT
			DISC
			IRON / STEEL ROD
			IRON PIPE
			CUT CROSS
			TREE WITH SIZE
			FIR TREE WITH SIZE
			BUSH
			ASPHALT
			CONCRETE
			GRAVEL

NOTE:
UNDERGROUND UTILITIES ARE SHOWN BY USING PHYSICAL EVIDENCE FOUND ON THE SURFACE AND/OR FROM UTILITY COMPANY FIELD STAKES AND, THEREFORE, THEIR LOCATIONS ARE APPROXIMATE AND SUSPECTED AND MAY NOT BE COMPLETELY ACCURATE. FOR MORE ACCURATE LOCATION, FIELD EXCAVATE.
PIPE FLOW DIRECTIONS, IF SHOWN, ARE BASED ON FIELD INVERT ELEVATIONS UNLESS EXISTING PLANS INDICATE OTHERWISE. IN WHICH CASE THE EXISTING PLAN FLOW DIRECTION IS SHOWN.
LAST DAY OF FIELD WORK: SEPT. 23, 2002
THE BOUNDARY SHOWN IS FROM AN A.L.T.A. / A.C.S.M. LAND TITLE SURVEY COMPLETED BY CE DESIGN, LTD. DATED OCTOBER 25, 1995
EXISTING ON-SITE IMPROVEMENTS NOT SHOWN AT REQUEST OF CLIENT.

EXISTING CONDITIONS		ARLINGTON 425	
CONSULTING ENGINEERS		ARLINGTON HEIGHTS, ILLINOIS	
SITE DEVELOPMENT ENGINEERS			
LAND SURVEYORS			
9575 W. Higgins Road, Suite 700, Rosemont, Illinois 60018 Phone: (847) 696-4060 Fax: (847) 696-4065			
SPACECO INC.			
FILENAME: 3514.02P-SE03			
DATE: 09/21/18			
JOB NO. 3514.02			
SHEET P-EC			
2 OF 5			

PRELIMINARY GEOMETRIC PLAN				
CONSULTING ENGINEERS SITE DEVELOPMENT ENGINEERS LAND SURVEYORS				
9575 W. Higgins Road, Suite 700, Rosemont, Illinois 60018 Phone: (847) 696-4060 Fax: (847) 696-4065				
 SPACECO INC.				
FILENAME: 3514.02P-GM				
DATE: 09/21/18				
JOB NO. 3514.02				
SHEET				
P-GM 3 OF 5				





NO.	DATE	REMARKS


NO.	DATE	REMARKS
5	04/03/19	PER ROUND 3 VILLAGE COMMENTS
4	03/14/19	REVISED SITE PLAN FROM ARCHITECT
3	02/18/19	REVISED SITE PLAN FROM ARCHITECT
2	01/16/19	REVISED SITE PLAN FROM ARCHITECT
1	11/08/18	REVISED SITE LAYOUT


PRELIMINARY GRADING PLAN
ARLINGTON 425
ARLINGTON HEIGHTS, ILLINOIS

CONSULTING ENGINEERS
SITE DEVELOPMENT ENGINEERS
LAND SURVEYORS
9575 W. Higgins Road, Suite 700, Rosemont, Illinois 60018 Phone: (847) 676-4060 Fax: (847) 676-4065


SPACECO INC.
FILENAME: 3514.02P-GR
DATE: 09/21/18
JOB NO. 3514.02
SHEET P-GR
4 OF 5







S. HIGHLAND AVENUE

PARKING
GARAGE

LIGHTING LEGEND

- R ROADWAY LIGHTING
- ES RELOCATE EXISTING STREET LIGHTING
- S STREET LIGHTING
- O ORNAMENTAL LIGHTING
- N NICHE LIGHTING
- W WALL WASH LIGHTING
- ▲▲ TREE UPLIGHTING

W. CAMPBELL STREET

225 W.
CAMPBELL

44 S.
HIGHLAND

COURTYARD
LIGHTING


225 W.
CAMPBELL

33 S.
CHESTNUT

S. CHESTNUT AVENUE



Lighting Plan Arlington 425 Arlington Heights, Illinois




NORTH


SCALE: 1"=20'




ISSUE DATE: April 2, 2019
All drawings are preliminary and subject to change.
© 2019 Hitchcock Design Group

PREPARED FOR:
CCH LLC







In Progress Details Included For Reference Only




1 Shade Tree Planting




2 Ornamental Tree Planting




3 Shrub Planting



4 Perennial And Groundcover Planting






6 Section - Sidewalk Through Tree Grate










7 Perennial Spacing And Planting Pattern

In Progress Details Included For Reference Only



1 Ornamental Fence




2 Ornamental Fence Adjustable Panel




3 Ornamental Metal Gate






1 Concrete Planter Curb




5 Unit Pavers


In Progress Details Included For Reference Only




3 Bench Receptacle Attachment



4 Planter GFRC




7 Brick Wall



DuMor, inc.
P.O. Box 142 Mifflintown, PA 17059-0142

SCALE: NONE
DATE DRAWN: 2/6/97
DRAWN BY: AH
DATE REV: 12/18/09
REV BY: AMH


TITLE: RECEPTACLE
REV: H
DRAWING NUMBER: 102-32-F70
SHEET: 1 OF 2




DuMor, inc.
P.O. Box 142 Mifflintown, PA 17059-0142

SCALE: NONE
DATE DRAWN: 9/20/97
DRAWN BY: JH
DATE REV: 12/18/06
REV BY: AMH

TITLE: BENCH
REV: E
DRAWING NUMBER: 119 SERIES
SHEET: 1 OF 2



(A) ORDER:
CENTER
ARM
REST
(B) ANCHOR
BENCH w/
STAINLESS
STEEL
BOLTS
BENCH
(Not to Scale)



DuMor, inc.
P.O. Box 142 Mifflintown, PA 17059-0142

SCALE: NONE
DATE DRAWN: 9/20/97
DRAWN BY: JH
DATE REV: 12/18/06
REV BY: AMH

TITLE: BENCH ASSEMBLY
REV: E
DRAWING NUMBER: 119 SERIES
SHEET: 2 OF 2



Landscape Details Arlington 425 Arlington Heights, Illinois

PREPARED FOR:
CCH LLC

ISSUE DATE: April 2, 2019
All drawings are preliminary and subject to change.
© 2019 Hitchcock Design Group

4.2.19

9 Stories = 1 Story Retail + 1 Story Retail & Office + 7 Stories Residential

Total Required Parking Stalls: 192.50
Total Provided Parking Stalls: 0

4.2.19

4 Stories Residential

Floor	Area (S.F.)	Amenity	Studio (1 Stall Per)	1 Bed (1 Stall Per)	2 Bed (1.25 Stalls Per)	Total DU	Parking Required	Parking Provided	Height
-0.5	21,032							58	-8'-0"
1	17,112	1,592	1	5	6	12	13.5		4'-0"
2	17,148		1	5	8	14	16		14'-8"
3	17,148		1	5	8	14	16		25'-4"
4	17,116		1	5	8	14	16		36'-0"
Roof									47'-6"
Parapet									51'-0"
Total DU			4	20	30	54			
Area/DU			300	300	400				
Total SF	89,556	1,592	1,200	6,000	12,000	19,200			
Total Required Parking Stalls:							61.50		
Total Provided Parking Stalls:								58	

Arlington 425 Unit Mix Parking

4.2.19

44 S. Highland Building

13 Stories = 6 Stories Parking Garage + 6 Stories Residential + 1 Story Amenities

Floor	Area (S.F.)	Retail	Amenity	Studio (1 Stall Per)	1 Bed (1 Stall Per)	2 Bed (1.25 Stalls Per)	Total DU	Parking Required	Parking Provided	Height
0	13,113								66	-10'-6"
1	30,323	2,869							68	-0'-6"
2	30,323								82	16'-6"
3	30,323								83	26'-6"
4	30,323								83	36'-6"
5	30,323								83	46'-6"
6	30,323								42	56'-6"
7	19,485			6	10	4	20	21		67'-6"
8	19,485			7	10	4	21	22		77'-6"
9	19,485			7	10	4	21	22		87'-6"
10	19,485			7	10	4	21	22		97'-6"
11	19,485			7	10	4	21	22		107'-6"
12	19,485			7	10	4	21	22		117'-6"
13	12,894		12,894							126'-6"
Roof										140'-0"
Parapet										141'-8"
Total DU				41	60	24	125			
Area/DU				300	300	400				
Total SF	324,855	2,869	12,894	12,300	18,000	9,600	39,900			

Total Required Parking Stalls: 131.00

Total Provided Parking Stalls: 507

Arlington 425 Unit Mix Parking
4.2.19

DEVELOPMENT UNIT AND PARKING SUMMARY

Building	Area (S.F.)	Studio (1 Stall Per)	1 Bed (1 Stall Per)	2 Bed (1.25 Stalls Per)	Total DU	Parking Required	Parking Provided
225 W Campbell	232,907	42	98	42	182	192.50	0
33 S Chestnut	89,556	4	20	30	54	61.50	58
44 S Highland	324,855	41	60	24	125	131.00	507
Total Units		87	178	96	361		
Total SF	647,318	26100	53400	38400	117900		
% Mix		24.10%	49.31%	26.59%			

Total Required Parking Stalls: 385.00

Total Provided Parking Stalls: 565

Parking Stalls Per Unit Ratio: 1.57

Site Square Footage (w/ 8'-0" Chestnut & Highland Dedications Removed): 119,780.8

Unit Density Square Footage Per Village Code: 117,900.0

Arlington 425 Unit Mix Parking

4.2.19

Restaurant / Retail / Office Parking Calculations - Campbell Building

1st Floor - East: 3,000 sf of Restaurant Seating ($1/200=15$) and 3,500 sf of Retail ($3,500-1,500=1,500$; $1/500=4$)

1st Floor - West: 7,000 sf of Retail ($1/500=14$)

Total East:	19
Total West:	14
Total 1st Floor:	33

2nd Floor - East: 3,500 sf of Restaurant Seating ($1/250=14$) and 3,500 Retail ($1/750=5$)

2nd Floor - West: 7,500 sf of Office ($7,500-2,000=5,500$; $5,500/750=7.33$ or 8)

Total East:	19
Total West:	8
Total 2nd Floor:	27


Restaurant / Retail / Office Parking Calculations - Highland Building

1st Floor: 2,000 sf of Retail ($2,000-1,500=500$; $1/500=1$)

Amenity Floor: 1,500 sf of Restaurant ($1/260=6$)


Total 1st Floor:	1
Total Amenity Floor:	6
Total Highland Building:	7

Total Stalls:	565
Residential Stalls Required:	385
Retail Stalls Required:	67
Excess Stalls Over Code:	113




GROUND FLOOR LEVEL PARKING GARAGE PLAN

CONCEPT 1 4-3-19




GROUND FLOOR LEVEL PARKING GARAGE PLAN


CONCEPT 2 4-3-19




1 GROUND SIGN ELEVATION
SCALE: 1/2" = 1'-0"



2 SIGN PLAN
SCALE: 1/2" = 1'-0"



3 SIGN SECTION
SCALE: 1/2" = 1'-0"



4 PLAN VIEW
SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"

Village of Arlington Heights

33 S. Arlington Heights Road
Arlington Heights IL 60005

SIGN DETAILS

Date:
4/4/2019

Revisions:

Scale:

Checked By:

Project Number:

Drawn By:
DM

Sheet Number:

DRAFT

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF
THE ARLINGTON HEIGHTS HOUSING COMMISSION
HELD AT ARLINGTON HEIGHTS VILLAGE HALL
VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS, ILLINOIS
May 6, 2019

IN ATTENDANCE:

Commissioners

Present: Mark Hellner Zach Creer
William Delea Andrew Tripp

Commissioners

Absent: Alex Hageli

Staff Present: Charles Witherington-Perkins, Director of Planning & Community Development
Nora Boyer, Housing Planner/Staff Liaison

On Behalf of Bruce Adreani, Developer, Arlington 425
Arlington 425: Michael Firsell, Attorney for the Developer
Debbie Smart, Briarwood Management

I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m.

A motion was made by Commissioner Creer, seconded by Commissioner Delea to select Commissioner Hellner to chair the meeting in the absence of Chairman Hageli. The motion passed unanimously.

II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

III. ROLL CALL

Commissioners present: M. Hellner, W. Delea, Z. Creer and A. Tripp.

Absent: A. Hageli

IV. Minutes

Chairman Hellner suggesting deferring approval of the minutes to a later meeting due to their length. The other Commissioners did not object to this suggestion.

V. OLD BUSINESS

A. Arlington 425 Response to Affordable Housing Guidelines

Chairman Hellner opened the discussion of this item saying that the Housing Commission would only be discussing the affordable housing aspect of the development. He said that there have been discussions between staff and the developer since the last Housing Commission meeting and progress has been made. He asked for a report from staff.

Charles Perkins updated the Housing Commission on what has transpired since last Monday (date of the last Housing Commission meeting on April 29, 2019). At the last meeting, there was discussion about whether the affordable housing component of the project should be 20 units at affordable at 80% Area Median Income (AMI) and payment of fee-in-lieu for 7 units or 18 units affordable at 60% AMI and payment for fee in lieu for 9 units. Members of the public spoke at the April 29th meeting who advocated for 54 affordable units. However, this percentage of affordable units has never been attained from a developer, especially without some form of government funding or financing. Mr. Perkins further explained that the developer has provided limited financials to the Village. He called each of the Housing Commissioners present and this meeting and briefly discussed on the information in the financials. No detailed pro-forma or cash flow analysis was provided. The financials did not change staff's recommendation. Staff continues to recommend 18 units affordable at 60% AMI and fee in lieu payments for 9 units at \$25,000 each.

Mr. Perkins explained that there have been extensive discussions with the developer's attorney since the last meeting. The Housing Commission meeting packet contains a redline version of the staff's recommendation as modified as a result of those discussions. The developer has agreed to provide 18 affordable units at 60% AMI and payment in lieu of units for 9 units at \$25,000 each for a total of \$225,000 with those funds going into the Trust Fund. Originally, staff recommended that the total fee amount be paid at the issuance of the first building permit. An agreement was reached where the total would be paid in three parts: 25% at the time of issuance of the garage/Highland building permit; 25% at the time of issuance of the first garage/Highland Building occupancy certificate; and 50% at the time of issuance of first Campbell Building occupancy certificate. This recognizes that the developer has a lot of costs early in the development and this staging of the payment of the fees allows the developer to begin construction and begin receiving rental income before all of the fees are due. The revised staff recommendation also provides that the developer may have flexibility up or down 3 units when leasing studio and one-bedroom units in order to allow them to be responsive to the units size preferences sought by eligible tenants. Implementing this flexibility will require prior staff approval. The staff recommendation was amended to add employees of Arlington Heights businesses and organizations to the groups receiving preference for the affordable units. The annual reporting date was changed from January 31 to March 31. Lastly, if the Village changes the program guidelines to be less restrictive prior to 12 months after the issuance of the first certificate of occupancy for the development, the least restrictive of the of the two standards will then be applied to the development.

Chairman Hellner asked if the developer is in agreement with these conditions as summarized by Mr. Perkins. Mr. Adreani said that he agrees to all the conditions.

Chairman Hellner asked if the Housing Commission members have comments. He said that the Housing Commission members have not discussed this matter since the last meeting.

Commissioner Delea said that at the last meeting the developer's attorney said that there was an over supply of affordable housing at the 60% AMI level and a shortage of supply of affordable housing at the 80% AMI level in this area; and therefore, the need is for more affordable housing at the 80% AMI level.

Mr. Michel Firsel responded he had referred to data for the project area from the Illinois Housing Development Authority website that states that 28% of the available units in the area affordable at 60% AMI were used for affordable housing and that 43% of the units affordable at 80% AMI were used for affordable housing. He said that the developer is comfortable with providing the 18 affordable units at the 60% AMI standard and that the data he cited is just one measure which he brought up to clarify that they did not necessarily concur that the need was greater at 60% AMI than 80% AMI.

Commissioner Delea said that he did some calculations and it seems to him that there is the need for more units. He asked if, since there is a need according to the developer for more units in the area at 80% AMI, the developer could provide the 9 affordable units as actual units rather than paying a fee in lieu of those units. He suggested that it would be better to have the units occupied to households at 80% AMI rather than having unoccupied units in the building since they would be getting some rental income.

Mr. Firsel said that there is a difference between something that is mandatory and voluntary. He said that they do not expect unusual vacancy rates, but the developer can always voluntarily decide to rent units below the market rate. There is a significant difference between the 80% affordable rental rate and the market rate; therefore, there would a significant difference in cash flow if that were done.

Commissioner Delea said that there would be a break even point after 4-5 years if the units were rented at the 80% AMI affordable rent rather than paying the fee in lieu amount. He said that income at the 80% AMI affordable rent would be a better use of the units rather than leaving them vacant.

Mr. Firsel said that Commissioner Delea's comments assume that there will be vacant units. Also, rather than restricting additional units, Mr. Adreana thinks that contributing the fee in lieu to the affordable housing fund is important. They believe that the 18 affordable units at 60% AMI is a fair compromise between what the developer has proposed and what the Village requested.

Chairman Hellner said that he made a calculation based on the \$225,000 fee which, if the developer kept that money in his pocket, would represent a subsidy for the 9 units for 4.5 – 5 years. By then, the development would be finished and close to 100% occupancy, revenues will be coming in, and the cash flow may be better with the 9 units at 80% keeping in mind that the \$225,000 was saved. He asked what was erroneous about that hypothetical.

Mr. Firsel said that Chairman Hellner is correct for the 5 years, but he assumes that something is going to happen at the end of that time in and into perpetuity. He said that the developer has asked to limit the affordable period to 20 years but agreed to in perpetuity. The developer cannot afford to risk assuming that revenues will continue to grow in perpetuity. Also, taxes and other costs will go up.

Chairman Hellner asked if the developer would consider renting the 9 units at 80% AMI for 10 – 15 years and renegotiate after that time if revenues have continued to increase. Mr. Adreani asked if the number of affordable units can be renegotiated after some time if revenues do not increase over time to which Chairman Hellner responded that he cannot answer that questions. Mr. Adreani said that neither can he answer Chairman Hellner's question.

Mr. Firsel stated that Mr. Adreani feels that the contribution to the trust fund is also important since the fund can help the Village meeting its goals. Chairman Hellner said that actual affordable units are more viable for immediate impact than is the trust fund.

Mr. Firsel said that the 9 units as affordable units will also decrease the value of the development due to the decrease in revenue for the units.

Commissioner Tripp said that he had no questions at this time, but staff has done a good job as reflected in where things stand currently.

Commissioner Creer said that it was probably too late, but perhaps the \$180,000 in the trust fund could be used with respect to the affordable units in this project.

Mr. Firsel said that one of the issues has been the lack of other ways to fund the gap between the affordable rents that can be charged and the market rents. Since there are no other mechanism about which they are aware, that is the basis for the current proposal. He said that the affordable housing component could be revisited in the future if funding becomes available.

Commissioner Delea asked Nora about the \$180,000 in fund now. He asked how much more is expected in the future since there is expected income. Chairman Hellner clarified that this is income for projects that will be paying fees in lieu in the future and that are under construction. Ms. Boyer asked for a few minutes to add up the fees in lieu that have been approved.

Chairman Hellner asked if the developer is assuming that Housing Choice Vouchers will not be used at the development. Mr. Firsel said that has not been taken into consideration.

Chairman Hellner said that that Housing Choice Vouchers would result in the developer receiving market rate rents. He wondered what should be done in that case since the developer's deficit would be reduced. Perhaps additional affordable units should be provided if that occurs.

Chairman Hellner also asked if the developer would consider waiving the \$100 - \$125/month parking space rental fee for the affordable units. Mr. Adreani said he would consider that on a per case basis. Other forms of transportation were mentioned.

Chairman Hellner said that the loss of revenue does not appear that great when spread across all of the units, at \$500/year per unit. Mr. Adreani responded that there are unknowns including anticipated increases in property taxes and possible increases in other costs to be covered by the project revenue.

Commissioner Tripp asked about the distribution of the affordable units. Mr. Adreani said that the plans are not far enough along for them to have discussed that level of detail yet.

Ms. Boyer reported on the income to the trust funds. She said that two projects have been approved that are completed or under construction that have or are paying into the trust fund for a total of \$150,400. There was some other income from the sale of some tax-exempt bond volume cap resulting in the \$180,000 to \$200,000 that has been mentioned. Two other projects are approved that are to pay fees in lieu, which are Arlington Downs at \$100,000 and the project in Hickory/Kensington at \$275,000. The total

approved is around \$550,000. Commissioner Delea said that he asked for that total number since the developer kept referring to there being \$180,000 in the fund and there is anticipated revenue just as the revenue from this project would initially be only anticipated. He wanted to compare apples and apples.

Chairman Hellner opened the meeting for public comments.

Geri Wasserman, representing Reclaim the NW Suburbs, asked if there are projections of income or profits for the development. She said the developer is very definite about losses but is not providing projections on profits.

Mr. Adreani listed a number of unknowns that prevent him from estimating revenues at this time. Chairman Hellner said that based on his experience, losses are more readily estimated than income.

Ms. Wasserman said that any developer can claim that they can't afford to provide affordable units. Mr. Firsel said that he did not think of affordable housing as a profit sharing endeavor. He said they are required to provide the affordable units whether they experience a profit or loss. He said they don't have the numbers because they do not have final plans and there are other unknowns.

Keith Moens stated that affordable units are needed in town and that he thinks that 18 affordable units and the other 9 units being provided as actual units with no fee in lieu payments would be reasonable. He thinks the difference between providing the 9 units at 80% AMI and paying the fee has to be marginal and could be worked out over the next few years. The developer will also receive more income due to inflation. He asked if the public can look at the financial information that was provided or if it can be obtained by filing a Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request.

Mr. Perkins said that the financial information received was marked confidential. If a FOIA request is received it would be reviewed by the Village's Legal Department to see what information can and cannot be released.

Mr. Moens commented that last week the developer said that units at 60% AMI cannot be done and now they have agreed to it. Also, he said that what the developer is agreeing to is not consistent with letters that were provided earlier to the Village. He said that he does not think the developer would walk if more was required, and that someone else would be happy to develop that block. He said he wants units not fees. He asked the Housing Commission to approve 18 units at 60% AMI and 9 units at 80% AMI.

Cathy Motto commented that money in the fund can come and go, but units last forever. She said that both are good, but the units would be lasting.

Tom Mussar said that he can't believe that the developers don't have any projections of revenue and income.

Heidi Graham, from the League of Women Voters and an Arlington Heights resident, said that she understands that this is a negotiation and that the developer should make money. However, she recently talked to a single mother about her need for affordable housing and she is concerned about there not being any affordable 2-bedroom units. She said that the children that she works with as an advocate in the foster care system need affordable housing. She asked that the Housing Commission push as hard as it can for as much affordable housing as it can get.

Dawn Frenzell, a neighborhood resident, said that there is an incredible need for affordable housing. She said that this is a great location for seniors moving out of their homes and who may no longer drive. She said that she has a son with Asperger's who would never be able to afford a market rate unit like this. She said that there are a lot of people in need of affordable housing through no fault of their own.

Lisa Doty said that she lives a block west of the proposed development. She said that she is all for affordable housing and thinks that affordable housing is a great idea for this development. However, she does not think that it is fair to put the burden of all of the past mistakes of the Village, and that other villages have made about affordable housing, on the backs of the developer of this project. She said that she thinks that the compromise staff and the developer have made is a good working compromise, and that it could be something that is a very good start for push developers to do more affordable housing. She said that she has pretty much been at every meeting on this project. The developer has talked about parking and other stuff. They have talked to them as neighbors. She said that the developer has been unbelievably good at listening, taking advice, making changes, changing direction, and doing all the things that need to be done. She thinks the developer is doing what they can on affordable housing, that staff has been a really good guide, and she thinks we need to accept the compromise in order to allow the development to move forward.

She said when we talk about jobs and income equality; this development will be bringing jobs and support local businesses. She pointed out that there will be \$2 million per year in property taxes that will go to Cook County and the Village, to our parks and library. They will bring in consumer spending that will make the downtown vibrant. She said that the affordable housing advocates should work with the Village in a separate way to see what we can do to make the ordinance have a little more teeth and to show developers that the Village is serious about affordable housing. She said that since the beginning, no one ever told the developer exactly what they needed to do for affordable housing. They were told what they needed to do for parking, building height and they complied with those requirements, but they were never told exactly about affordable housing and that the affordable housing has been all over the place. She said that the Housing Commission should agree to the compromise and move this along to the Village Board because every time there is a meeting it delays the project and money and the benefits to the Village are delayed, and she thinks that it is time that we stopped doing this.

Commissioner Hellner asked "tongue in cheek" if Ms. Doty isn't an employee of the developer. Ms. Doty said that she is not. She objected to the question, and there was an exchange between Commissioner Hellner and Ms. Doty about whether this inquiry impugned her integrity.

Commissioner Delea said that it was not correct that the developer was never told what the affordable housing requirement was. He said they were told that there was a specific requirement of 54 units, and we have now reduced that substantially. He said that you can't say that they were not told the requirement or that we have done nothing toward that.

Commissioner Tripp said that he agreed with Ms. Doty that there could be more clarity on the guidelines and how they are applied moving forward.

Chairman Hellner also agreed with Ms. Doty that there will be overall benefit to the community including the tax revenues and the overall support of businesses. These are things that should not and are not being ignored.

Geri Wasserman said that all of those things will happen and there can be affordable housing. She said that they are not against development and profit, but she feels they need to speak for people with needs.

Mr. Firsel said that the developer appreciates everyone's comments. He wants to make clear that the developer has been pushed by staff and he pointed out that what the developer is agreeing to is in alignment with the staff proposal. He urged the Housing Commissioners to take all comments into consideration and support the staff recommendation. He said that we all know what the alternative is.

Mr. Moens said he took Mr. Firsel's comment as a threat. Chairman Hellner said that he understood Mr. Firsel's comment and that the most powerful part of negotiation is your feet.

Mr. Firsel said that this has been discussed at great length; they have done a lot of research and have looked at other projects. He made the statement that the guidelines have to be reviewed, to which Chairman Hellner agreed. He said that the guidelines not having been strictly followed can't be put on one developer, although he isn't saying that is what is happening here. Mr. Adreani and he have offered to meet and talk about the guidelines to help frame standards that are economically viable and add meat to the bones of the guidelines as far as what can be achieved in the best way possible. He said that they are in favor of affordable housing, but there is a big pie here and this is a piece of that pie. He said that working with staff, staff and Mr. Adreani have come to an agreement they are comfortable with. He urged the Housing Commission to adopt the staff proposal.

Chairman Hellner turned the Housing Commission to its deliberation.

At motion was made by Commissioner Tripp, seconded by Commissioner Creer to accept the staff recommendations for Arlington 425.

Discussion followed. Commissioner Creer stated that this is a good package overall. He said that you have to look at the whole picture. He is excited for this development. He thanked everyone for coming and thanked the developer for participating in the process. He said that this is a good step on which to move forward. He said that it is hard to get affordable housing when the Village isn't offering anything in terms of money such in the case with a development is a tax increment financing (TIF) district. In this case, the Village not putting anything into the kitty. He said that parking is being provided also, which is not his priority, but that is why this is a community process. He thanked staff for their work and thanked everyone for coming. He said that staff negotiated a good and hard deal.

Commissioner Delea said that he is not happy with deal, but it is in line with what we have done in the past. He is looking forward to more strict requirements for the future. He said that he is not happy, but it would not be fair to be so easy-going and then changing on this project. However, we need to be stricter going forward.

Commissioner Tripp thanked members of the audience and community at large, including people not here tonight for their involvement in the process. He said that the Housing Commission is charged with a complicated balancing act involving concerns from throughout the community including those of the developer. He said that developments like this are complicated and staff came up with reasonable solution. He said that what is most important is fairness, consistency and transparency, and that we tried to provide that. He thinks this is consistent with what we have done in the past.

Chairman Hellner pointed out that one of the issues is that the Village has guidelines not mandates. He said the Village went in this direction because there had been no multi-family development in a long period of time. One project generated the belief that we needed to get into this. Not many communities have affordable housing requirements in this area. Other than the City of Chicago, the communities that do are Arlington Heights, Highland Park, Evanston, Lake Forest, St. Charles and Oak Park. He said that is sad, and he is glad we have this, but agreed that we need to work on it. The economy is different now and this is only the second large development project in that period of time. The first was Arlington Downs. He said that he thinks he supports all of the comments made by the other Commissioners.

Chairman Hellner said that he still has a preference and wondered if a modification to the motion would be allowed stating that our preference is to have 18 units at 60% and 9 units at 80% with the second alternative - an a/b proposal basically to the Village Board – being the staff recommendation. He said that he concurs with Commissioner Tripp that staff did a good job. The developer was flexible, moved a good deal and brought about a fast turnaround. He appreciated that the public came out twice in a period of eight days and said that was commendable. The Housing Commission has learned a lot in the two meetings. He said there are weaknesses in what we are dealing with, but asked that people please keep in mind that everyone needs something of a win. He said that this is an enormous project in a village of this size with the addition of 361 residential units, parking, property tax generation, and spending of people who live there. All of these are important. He does not want to prevent this from going forward. He thinks that his economic argument about the 9 units at 80% is sound. He recognizes that with any project that the revenue projection come with speculation associated with them, but he thinks his proposal makes more sense and is more helpful to the community. He doesn't think it would be as burdensome to the developer as they may think, although he admittedly doesn't have skin in the game.

There was a procedural discussion about whether to proceed by amending the current motion or voting on that motion and considering a second motion. Commissioners Tripp and Creer indicated that they would accept Chairman Hellner's proposed modification to the motion. Chairman Hellner said that the motion then was that the Housing Commission recommends the staff motion subject to a further recommendation that in lieu of the \$225,000 there is a preference that the developer provide the 9 units at 80% AMI instead, with no cash fee in lieu.

Ms. Boyer asked for clarification on the motion. Mr. Perkins asked that the maker of the amended motion restate the motion. Commissioner Tripp, who made the original motion followed up with the motion below, which was amended from the original motion with the amendment accepted by Commissioner Tripp (the maker of the motion) and Commissioner Creer (who seconded the original motion):

Commissioner Tripp moved to accept the staff's recommendations with the modification with that the Commission states a preference for the additional 9 additional units to be at 80% AMI with no cash in lieu requirement. The vote was taken and the motion was approved unanimously.

Chairman Hellner thanked everyone for coming. He said that he appreciates the comments and will welcome comments about how to change the guidelines and how to use the trust fund money. Comments can be sent to Planningmail@vah.com.

Mr. Adreani thanked the Housing Commission, staff and his attorney. He said that he still thinks that providing money to the trust fund would be beneficial to the community and his providing that contribution is

consistent with the values that have resulted in his making other charitable contributions in the community.

Mr. Perkins announced that the Arlington 425 project will be going to a special meeting of the Village Board on May 13, 2019. The time is to be determined and will be available on the Village's website.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Commissioner Delea, seconded by Commissioner Creer, to adjourn the meeting. The motion passed unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 7:20 pm.

NEXT MEETING: TO BE DETERMINED

Staff Report to the Housing Commission

To: The Chairman and Members of the Housing Commission
From: Nora Boyer, Housing Planner
Re: Arlington 425 – Response to Affordable Housing Guidelines
Report Prepared: May 3, 2019
Meeting Date: May 6, 2019

Background

At its meeting on April 29, 2019, the Housing Commission reviewed the developer's affordable housing proposal with respect to Arlington 425. For the meeting, the Housing Commissioners received a staff report containing information about the developer's response to the Village's affordable housing guidelines, the staff's analysis, and staff recommendations. At the meeting, comments and questions were taken from the public, and responses were given. After a period of deliberation, the Housing Commissioners determined they needed additional information before either supporting the staff recommendation or making their own recommendation. It was determined that further deliberation would take place at a future meeting.

Update

Since the April 29, 2019 Housing Commission meeting, staff received limited financial information from the developer which was labeled as confidential. The additional information does not change staff's recommendation as presented to the Housing Commission on April 29, 2019. However, as a result of discussions with the developer, few of modifications have been made to some points in the recommendation.

Agreement

The developer has stated that they are in agreement with the attached amended staff recommendation, which states that 18 actual affordable units will be provided for households at or below 60% of area median income at rents affordable to that income level. The developer also agreed to pay a fee in lieu of 9 affordable units at \$25,000 per unit (total \$225,000) to be deposited into the Affordable Housing Trust Fund.

Recommendation

It is recommended that the affordable housing component of Arlington 425 meet the conditions as attached.

ARLINGTON 425 AFFORDABLE HOUSING RECOMMENDATIONS

REVISED MAY 3, 2019

1. 18 actual affordable units be provided (5% of all units), affordable at 60% Area Median Income (AMI) that are to be affordable in perpetuity.
2. A payment in lieu of 9 units (2.5% of all units) to be paid at \$25,000 per unit (\$225,000 total) ~~as follows: at the time of permit issuance for the first building to be constructed at Arlington 425.~~
 - a) 25% at the time of issuance of Garage/Highland Building Permit.
 - b) 25% at the time of issuance of first Garage/Highland Building Occupancy Certificate.
 - c) 50% at the time of issuance of first Campbell Building Occupancy Certificate.
3. The income eligibility standard for the affordable units is to be 60% of the Area Median Income (AMI) for the Chicago-Joliet-Naperville area, adjusted for household size as updated annually by HUD.
4. The maximum rents are to be the rents determined to be affordable to households at 60% of Area Median Income (AMI) for the applicable unit sizes (studio and one-bedroom units) according to the method used by the Illinois Housing Development Authority (IHDA) for the Chicago Metro Area.
5. ~~The affordable units for the Arlington 425 development may be restricted to the Highland and Campbell Buildings. That~~ 1/3 of the 18 affordable units will be studio units (6 studio units) and 2/3 of the affordable units will be one-bedroom units (12 one-bedroom units), which is consistent with the proportions of these units in the development. ~~However, owner may periodically adjust up or down between the studio and 1-bedroom units by no more than three units subject to prior approval from the Village.~~
6. Preference for tenancy of the affordable units will be given to current Arlington Heights residents, ~~employees of Arlington Heights businesses or organizations, -and/or veterans.~~
7. The ~~owner developer~~ shall submit an annual report concerning compliance with the affordable housing program by ~~March~~ ~~January~~ 31 of each year in a form as determined by the Village and in compliance with all other elements of the guidelines.
8. If the Village's affordable housing guidelines are revised prior to ~~12 months after issuance of the first Certificate of occupancy permit~~ ~~the issuance of the first building permit for this project~~ to standards that are ~~less lower~~ ~~restrictive~~ than what the ~~owner developer~~ and Village agree upon, ~~than the least restrictive that the lower~~ of the two standards will ~~then~~ be applied.

ARLINGTON 425 AFFORDABLE HOUSING RECOMMENDATIONS

REVISED MAY 3, 2019

1. 18 actual affordable units be provided (5% of all units), affordable at 60% Area Median Income (AMI) that are to be affordable in perpetuity.
2. A payment in lieu of 9 units (2.5% of all units) to be paid at \$25,000 per unit (\$225,000 total) as follows:
 - a) 25% at the time of issuance of Garage/Highland Building Permit.
 - b) 25% at the time of issuance of first Garage/Highland Building Occupancy Certificate.
 - c) 50% at the time of issuance of first Campbell Building Occupancy Certificate.
3. The income eligibility standard for the affordable units is to be 60% of the Area Median Income (AMI) for the Chicago-Joliet-Naperville area, adjusted for household size as updated annually by HUD.
4. The maximum rents are to be the rents determined to be affordable to households at 60% of Area Median Income (AMI) for the applicable unit sizes (studio and one-bedroom units) according to the method used by the Illinois Housing Development Authority (IHDA) for the Chicago Metro Area.
5. The affordable units for the Arlington 425 development may be restricted to the Highland and Campbell Buildings. 1/3 of the 18 affordable units will be studio units (6 studio units) and 2/3 of the affordable units will be one-bedroom units (12 one-bedroom units), which is consistent with the proportions of these units in the development. However, owner may periodically adjust up or down between the studio and 1-bedroom units by no more than three units subject to prior approval from the Village.
6. Preference for tenancy of the affordable units will be given to current Arlington Heights residents, employees of Arlington Heights businesses or organizations, and/or veterans.
7. The owner shall submit an annual report concerning compliance with the affordable housing program by March 31 of each year in a form as determined by the Village and in compliance with all other elements of the guidelines.
8. If the Village's affordable housing guidelines are revised prior to 12 months after issuance of the first Certificate of occupancy to standards that are less restrictive than what the owner and Village agree upon, than the least restrictive of the two standards will then be applied.

DRAFT

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF
THE ARLINGTON HEIGHTS HOUSING COMMISSION
HELD AT ARLINGTON HEIGHTS VILLAGE HALL
VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS, ILLINOIS
April 29, 2019

IN ATTENDANCE:

Commissioners

Present: Mark Hellner Zach Creer
William Delea Andrew Tripp

Commissioners

Absent: Alex Hageli Namrita Nelson

Staff Present: Charles Witherington-Perkins, Director of Planning & Community Development
Nora Boyer, Housing Planner/Staff Liaison

On Behalf of Bruce Adriani, Developer, Arlington 425
Arlington 425: Michael Firsell, Attorney for the Developer

I. CALL TO ORDER/PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. and the Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

II. ROLL CALL

Commissioners present: Hellner, Delea, Creer and Tripp.

Absent: Hageli and Nelson

A motion was made by Commissioner Creer, seconded by Commissioner Tripp to select Commissioner Hellner to chair the meeting in the absence of Chairman Hageli. The motion was approved unanimously.

III. Minutes

A motion was made by Commissioner Delea, seconded by Commissioner Creer to approve the minutes of the January 22, 2019 meeting with two minor edits. The motion was approved unanimously.

IV. REPORTS

No report.

V. OLD BUSINESS

No report.

VI. NEW BUSINESS

A. Arlington 425 Response to Affordable Housing Guidelines

Commissioner Hellner stated that although staff has been involved with discussing the development with the developer, this is the first that the development has become before the Housing Commission. The Housing Commission only addresses the affordable housing component of the project.

Ms. Boyer summarized the Staff Report to the Housing Commission that was posted on the Village website concerning Arlington 425 project. Ms. Boyer stated that the Arlington 425 project is a development proposed for the north three quarters of the block in downtown Arlington Heights bounded by Campbell, Sigwalt, Highland and Chestnut Avenue. The project is proposed to include 3 buildings with a total of 361 units.

The Arlington Heights affordable housing guidelines call for developments of this size (over 26 units) to set aside 15% of their units as affordable to households that are at or below 60% of area median income. The guidelines applied to this development call for 54 affordable units.

Ms. Boyer said that staff has held several meetings with the developer. The developer's first, formal response to the affordable housing guidelines was received by the Village on December 21, 2018. The developer's proposal was to provide 15 affordable units.

Most recently, the developer proposed to provide 27 affordable units as units or fees in lieu of units. During a meeting, the developer offered to provide the 27 affordable units as 20 actual affordable units affordable to renters 80% of AMI at affordable rents, and fees in lieu of units for seven units at \$25,000 each for a total of \$175,000.

The staff alternative offered on April 12, 2019 included 27 affordable units as follows: 1) 18 actual affordable units; 2) for households with incomes at or below 60% AMI at rents affordable to this income level; 3) with the affordable units be studio and one-bedroom units; and 4) fee in lieu payments for 9 units at \$25,000 per unit. It was also discussed that if the affordable guidelines are revised in the future, the lower of the requirements approved for the development or the revised guidelines would apply.

Staff has reviewed the affordable housing component of Arlington 425 based on the cost to the developer to provide affordable housing units. Staff also considered:

- 1) The Village guidelines and Village directives which emphasize providing affordable units over the payment of fees in lieu of units;
- 2) What the income eligibility income and rent standards should be. The guidelines call for 60% AMI which is the standard used by the State under the Illinois Affordable Housing Planning and Appeal Act that calls for 10% of units in municipalities to be affordable. Also, a 2013 housing study states that there is more need in Arlington Heights for rental units affordable for households around 60% AMI than at 80% AMI;

3) Unit mix according to the guidelines the unit mix should be proportional to the development overall. In this case the developer has requested an exemption from providing two-bedroom units and asks to provide only studio and one-bedroom units.

The staff recommendation for this meeting as it appears in the Staff Report was follows:

After analyzing the cost of providing affordable units, financial impacts on the Arlington 425 developer, and the Village Boards goals and directives, it is recommended that the affordable housing component of Arlington 425 meet the following conditions:

1. 18 actual affordable units be provided (5% of all units), affordable at 60% Area Median Income (AMI) that are to be affordable in perpetuity.
2. A payment in lieu of 9 units (2.5% of all units) to be paid at \$25,000 per unit (\$225,000 total) at the time of permit issuance for the first building to be constructed at Arlington 425.
3. The income eligibility standard for the affordable units is to be 60% of the Area Median Income (AMI) for the Chicago-Joliet-Naperville area, adjusted for household size as updated annually by HUD.
4. The maximum rents are to be the rents determined to be affordable to households at 60% of Area Median Income (AMI) for the applicable unit sizes (studio and one-bedroom units) according to the method used by the Illinois Housing Development Authority (IHDA) for the Chicago Metro Area.
5. That 1/3 of the 18 affordable units to be studio units (6 studio units) and 2/3 of the affordable units to be one-bedroom units (12 one-bedroom units), which is consistent with the proportions of these units in the development.
6. Preference for tenancy of the affordable units will be given to current Arlington Heights residents and/or veterans.
7. The developer shall submit an annual report concerning compliance with the affordable housing program by January 31 of each year in a form as determined by the Village and in compliance with all other elements of the guidelines.
8. If the Village's affordable housing guidelines are revised prior to the issuance of the first building permit for this project to standards that are lower than what the developer and Village agree upon, that the lower of the two standards will be applied.

Mr. Perkins stated that Arlington Heights is one of five or six communities in Illinois, outside of Chicago, that require affordable units in developments. The other communities being Highland Park, Lake Forest, Evanston, St. Charles and Oak Park a month ago. Arlington is somewhat of a leader in this area. He stated that, in fairness, the 15% of affordable housing units called for in the guidelines has not been achieved in rental developments. Most recently, the approval for Arlington Downs required nine affordable units.

Exceptions have been Heart's Place where all of the units are subsidized and Parkview, which was financed with Low-Income Housing Tax Credits. In both of these cases, the developer exceeded the 15% is affordability level in the guidelines. The other rental developments in the Village paid the fees in lieu of units. As acceptance of affordable housing has increased, the amount of the fee in lieu approved has increased.

Commissioner Hellner stated that audience comments will be heard. He asked that comments address this project specifically. He also stated the questions of the developer will be permitted. He asked that the discourse be civil.

Before taking comments from the public, Mr. Michael Firsel, attorney for the developer said that certain things have been discussed around the community and he hoped to answer some audience question in his presentation.

Mr. Firsel said that since the developer went to the Village Board for early review, they have been told and have been responsive to the Village's desire to have actual affordable units in the development rather than providing the full amount of affordable housing as payment of fees. rather than payment of fees. He said that this is a \$150 million project and that the per unit cost is not the \$204,000 reported in the Staff Report but is more than \$300,000. He reported having done research that contradicts certain assertion in the Staff Report and that there is a need for more units at 80% AMI in the zone identified by the Illinois Housing Development Authority (IHDA) than for units affordable at 60% AMI.

He stated that the 18 actual units proposed by the developer exceeds any percentage or amount of affordable housing provided by any other developer including at Arlington Downs. The payment in lieu would be \$225,000, which the Village would use to supplement or provide affordable.

He said it is impossible to provide 54 affordable units in this project and be able to finance it. Several consultants, including SB Freedman have told the developer that even affordable housing providers cannot afford to provide units at 60% AMI unless there are government subsidies or special financing provided to support the affordable units. He said that no subsidies or special financing have been offered to the developer. He said that he would respond to the staff recommendations specifically with other proposed edits but wanted to point out that the developer is in agreement with respect to providing tenant preferences in the following order: 1) to veterans; 2) to Arlington Heights residents; and 3) to veterans who are not Arlington Heights residents, before offering units to other applicants.

The meeting was opened to comments by the public.

Heidi Graham identified herself as appearing officially as the President of the local League of Women Voters and as a long-time resident of Arlington Heights. She commented that the League of Women Voters holds the position nationally that affordable housing is a priority issue, and public and private affordable housing is needed by many segments of communities. She said that the community is not viable unless there is housing for all income levels. She recommended not going below the guidelines set by the Village.

Mr. Mussar asked for clarification from the developer if he is redefining affordable housing as affordable at 80% rather than 60% and also lowering the number of units being offered. The developer responded that the proposal is 18 units at 80% affordable.

Geri Wasserman identified herself as a resident of Glenview and as a representative of Reclaim NW Suburbs which has members from many of the northwest suburbs. Her points were that Arlington 425 should include a fair amount of affordable units at the 60% AMI level and that the \$25,000 fee in lieu amount is too low. She said other communities have set their fee in lieu at amounts at levels such as \$125,000 per unit. She also stated that Arlington Heights should adopt its guidelines by ordinance in order that developers will know what is expected of them and in order to avoid the need to negotiate. She talked about Evanston's program, which is adopted by ordinance, and provides incentives and bonuses to developers in order to incentivize units over the payment of fees.

Susan Catlin, resident of Arlington Heights, stated that she does not want all this affordable housing in Arlington Heights. She said that when she moved here everyone was the same and we didn't have all this crime with people who can't afford to live here. She lives a half a block away and is concerned for her safety.

Cindy Churchill, who stated that she lives across the street from the proposed development and has not agreed with some aspects of the project, but she stated that she agrees with what the developer is offering. She said that she read on the Village website that the Arlington Heights police are concerned about the project.

Charles Perkins stated that he thought she was referring to an article in the *Arlington Cardinal* about Parkview Apartments and in which some of the information about police calls was attributed to unspecified sources. Parkview is on the north side of downtown and is a 45-unit apartment development that was financed with Low-Income Housing Tax Credits. The Village requirement on that development was seven affordable units, but they actually have closer to 40 or 41 affordable units at less than 60%. It is a different program than what we are talking about here. It is apples and oranges and not a good comparison. He pointed out that Dunton Tower has 20% affordable units since it was built 20 – 25 years ago. He said that there are always police calls to apartment buildings, but it has been nothing out of the norm at the Dunton Tower development.

Commissioner Hellner said that most of the calls at Parkview have been about parking issues. He said that people should be cautious about reports from unattributed sources.

Laura (no last name provided) said that she has family and friends with the Arlington Heights Police Department who made her aware of the Arlington 425 project. She said that she thinks it is valid to talk about Parkview Apartments in this discussion. She didn't want to name the offices but she heard from them that a lot of the police calls to Parkview Apartments involved violent incidents. She described one violent incident, which was also reported in the *Daily Herald*, regarding a man who she doesn't think was supposed to be living there, but his grandmother let him move in. He beat his grandmother, tried to take an officer's gun and bit an officer, and who was subsequently arrested. She spoke about another incident when a woman would not let the police in when a child was choking. Commissioner Hellner asked if she had personal knowledge of these incidents. Laura said that she heard these things from family and friends who are cops. She then said that she spoke to the management at Parkview Apartments and learned that 15 units are Housing Authority and Cook County units, and that an investor purchased 25 units and allowed them to be Low-Income Housing Tax Credit units, and crime has increased there. She wanted to know, if the developer pays the fee in lieu units, if there anything the Village can to prevent someone from purchasing units at Arlington 425 and making more units into low-income units.

Charles Perkins responded that there is nothing to stop a private sale of property. He said that a new owner could lower rents if they could do so and still meet their debt service. However, it is unlikely that this would happen. He said federal fair housing laws limit what the Village can do. Parkview Apartments, which is not under discussion tonight, was developed using Low-Income Housing Tax Credits by a developer who specializes in developing that kind of building with a higher percentage of affordable units. That is not what we are talking about with Arlington 425, which is a high end, market rent development. It would be difficult to bring down the rents to the affordable levels we are talking about even with Low-Income Housing Tax Credits. Mr. Firsel confirmed this comment. With Parkview Apartments, it was known that the developer was seeking Low-Income Housing Tax Credits, which might result in 19 affordable units. It was not known that 41 unit would be affordable.

Peg Martin asked about the relevance of Parkview Apartments to the discussion tonight since it is an entirely different kind of development.

Dawn Frenzell said she is in support of affordable housing and a diverse community. She said that people like her parents, who are retired, who have difficulty affording the home they are in could, and senior who may or may not drive, can use this type of affordable housing so that they can remain in the community that they built over many years as residents. The location near amenities within walking distance is perfect for permitting long-term residence to remain independent and in their community. She also said that she has a young adult son with Asperger's who would never be able to afford housing on his own in the community could use an opportunity like this and would greatly benefit from affordable housing, especially at a location like this. She said that we need to figure out how we are going to support people who are on the spectrum and other members of our community to be able to live here. She had a question about the fees in lieu that are collected and their uses and commented that it must be lot of money by now.

Nora Boyer stated that the amount currently in the Affordable Housing Trust Fund is about \$200,000. More in fees has been recently approved in connection with development projects, but since the fees are collected a while after the projects are approved, the funds come later when permits are issued. It was explained that fees are being built up, but the fees come in slowly. Ms. Frenzell suggested that many people become in need of affordable housing through no fault of their own and the collected fees could be used to help people experiencing hardships. Mr. Perkins said that the priority is to use funds to create units not to use the funds for subsidies where the funds would get used up. There are other programs for that. Commissioner Creer stated that the Housing Commission is the citizens advisory group on the Affordable Housing Trust Fund.

Keith Moens who lives in Arlington Heights described the developer's proposal of 20 affordable units as a borderline insult compared to what should be done in this community. He said we need a whole lot more than 20. He said that letters from the developer to the Village Manager indicated that the developer would provide affordable units and rather than cash in lieu and comply with the affordable housing requirements. He said that the developer should not be afraid of affordable units and that providing affordable units would enable the developer to influence and take advantage of demand for higher rent and affordable rent markets with the rents on the higher units going up since the supply would be reduced by the number of affordable units. He said there is plenty of demand for 54 affordable units, certainly more than 20 affordable units. He asked that the developer double or more the number of affordable units, at 60% AMI and look at one and two-bedroom units which is what working families need.

Mr. Firsel responded that he needed to rebut some comments that were just made that were unfair. He said that the developer initially offered only affordable units with no cash when it initially proposed 15 affordable units. He said that the Village asked the developer to get to 27 units through units and cash-in-lieu and they did that. He said that the developer kept their word. He said that the developer is not afraid of affordable housing, rather the number of affordable units that can be included is an economic issue. He pointed out that 15% has never been achieved in the Village, and the need for affordable housing cannot be solved by this development. He further pointed out that none of the nearby suburbs have this type of requirement.

Kathleen (no last name given) stated that she is excited to see something flourish on this block. She thinks that the developer's proposal is reasonable. She said that the residents of the high rises support the downtown businesses and this link needs to be considered. In response to her question, it was clarified that the income eligibility standard applied to Dunton Tower is 80% of AMI, which was the standard used under the government industrial revenue bond financing mechanism used at the time for Dunton Tower. Mr. Firsel pointed out that Dunton Tower was also not required to build parking, and they rent their parking in the Village garage; whereas, Arlington 425 is building parking.

Tom Melody stated that he moved to Arlington Heights once he could afford to. He said that providing affordable housing for persons making \$35,000/year provides a disincentive to make more and lose their subsidy. He appreciates the preference for veterans. He supports the developer's plan.

Janet Niemeyer said that she is a longtime resident of Arlington Heights. She is providing housing now for a woman and her adult son who need affordable housing. She said that they are applying to programs, but it is difficult. She said that affordable housing is an important issue. She said that being a City of Good Neighbors is in our DNA, and she thinks it is beneficial to make opportunities for people to come to live and contribute to Arlington Heights. She said that she favors the 60% AMI level.

Ray Crocker asked that the Village dig deep to provide as much affordable housing as we can in this and other projects in Arlington Heights. He said that there need to be communities where the haves invite the have-nots to come. He likes diversity and would like to see the developer increase the number of affordable units. He said that the numbers seem awfully low to him, that they have done a pretty good job, but thinks we could do better if the developer will take a little less profit.

Dave Weiner said that during the Parkview Apartment approval process, discussion of low-income housing was turned to discussing affordable housing. He asked that Arlington 425 be held to having an affordable component not a low-income component. He also stressed the importance of enough parking. He said that he lives right behind the Parkview building and there are parking issues there.

Mark Bostrom with the *Arlington Cardinal* said that people in the audience had the right to be skeptical about the development and that does not mean that they are against affordable housing. He questioned Commissioner Hellner and Mr. Perkins about their comments regarding his Arlington Cardinal article and it having unattributed sources. He also questioned Commissioner Hellner's source for his statement that most of the police calls to Parkview Apartments have been parking related. Commissioner Hellner said that he got his information by checking with the building manager.

Mr. Bostrom said that since Mr. Perkins criticized the sources in his article, he was asking if Mr. Perkins knows about calls to Parkview or has knowledge of any social service, law enforcement or other internal

memos discussing problems at Parkview Apartments. Mr. Perkins said that he was not being critical, he just said that there were comments reported in the article that came from unspecified sources. He said that he is aware that there is a higher number of calls at Parkview Apartments. He said that he thought he said that. He also explained how the development was funded, that the income levels are lower at Parkview Apartments, and there has been a higher volume of calls there. He said that Village's social services employees and the police are working with the residents and management through the Village's Community Policing program.

Mr. Bostrom stressed that residents concerns about Arlington 425 are understandable given events at Parkview Apartment and that the Village should be open and responsive to those concerns. There was than a discussion about whether or not there is a correlation between household income and crime.

Mr. Habib commented his main concerns were adequate parking and how sustainable the buildings will be. It was explained that these topics are not under the purview of the Housing Commission, but the plans are online and there have been two Plan Commission hearings that included discussion about parking. The Housing Commission can only talk about the affordable housing.

A question was asked about whether there is a difference between the terms affordable housing and low-income housing. Commissioner Hellner said there terms are not precisely defined. The Low-Income Housing Tax Credit program, is a financing mechanism for affordable housing which is difficult to obtain. He said that 60% of AMI is typically used to define affordable housing; and generally, housing is considered affordable if monthly housing cost do not exceed 30% of monthly income. How Arlington Heights guidelines have been applied has varied over time under different market conditions and seeking affordable units has become more aggressive as the housing market has improved.

Laura asked how the Parkview Apartment project started. Mr. Perkins explained that the developer was applying for Low-Income Housing Tax Credits and as part of the tax credits, they were required to have 19 affordable units. He said that he thinks tax credit income eligibility is lower than 60% AMI. Laura asked the difference between tax credits and Cook County assistance. Commissioner Hellner explained the Cook County program is a voucher program that subsidizes the rents of voucher holders. Laura said that she grew up around public housing that was a problem and she just doesn't want that to happen here, especially for the sake of children. She wanted to know how Arlington 425 will be different from Parkview Apartments so that problems happening at Parkview don't happen with Arlington 425. Laura said she likes the preferences that have been discussed and would favor other preferences such as senior citizens from outside of Arlington Heights. She said that she just wants to make sure Arlington 425 is safe.

Commissioner Hellner said there is crime everywhere that has to be dealt with. He said that if any tenant that lives there, or their guests, have a voucher and they commit a crime, they will lose the voucher under the voucher program. He said that managers do not have incentives to have bad tenants. The Village also deals with law enforcement. Mr. Perkins said that the staff proposal is that 5% of units at Arlington 425 be affordable which is very different from what has happened at Parkview Apartments. The Village seeks to distribute affordable units.

Mr. Habib (last name inaudible) asked if this \$150 million project will bring jobs with it to govern the development.

Mr. Firsel called on Debbie Smart, Arlington Heights resident and representative of Briarwood Management. It was explained that Briarwood Management is the management company for Arlington 425. Ms. Smart said that developer has gone through a great deal of due diligence and multiple public hearings on this project. She said the uniqueness of this project is that property management was brought onto the team from day one. She said they have been involved in the affordable housing, parking plan, etc. By having the management company in the process they are able to develop a management methodology that will work. They are making sure there are proper rules, a sense of ownership in developed, etc. to make it a great place live. She said that Mr. Adreani has been developing properties for many years and has been paying \$40,000/year in property taxes on the site which he has left unfenced. He will pay \$2 million in property taxes after development is built, and \$5 million/year in spending will be brought into the community as a result of the development. There will be 100 new jobs related to the commercial space, office space, and for the buildings. Ms. Smart said that she is a proponent of affordable housing but there needs to be a balance between what can asked for in terms of affordable housing and what the developer can afford to provide. She said that the developer is an honorable person and his heart is in the right place. She said that, by coincidence, she lives in one of his buildings downtown and it is among the best buildings downtown. She is comfortable that this is a great project for Arlington Heights.

Mr. Habib (last name inaudible) commented that he agrees that the number of units should come up some and be at 60% AMI, and he expects there to be millennials just starting with first jobs to be interested in the affordable units. He said crime is going to happen but how the community deals with it is what matters.

Chris Jones asked if there is still room to negotiate on the affordable housing component; whether the 60% vs. 80% AMI and no two bedroom units is set. Commissioner Hellner responded that things are still up for negotiation. The Housing Commission will make a recommendation to the Village Board. The Housing Commission does not have to accept the staff recommendation. Ultimately, final decisions are up to the Village Board. There have been two lengthy Plan Commission public hearings on the project, and comments will be accepted at the Village Board meeting when this project is considered. There is usually a three minute per person comment limit at the Village Board level.

Peg Martin asked if there are Village officials financial interest in the project. She said that Trustee Tinaglia is the architect on the project. Mr. Firsel said that Mr. Tinaglia has been absent or has recused himself from all meetings on this project. Public officials are required annually to disclose financial involvement with Village business. The normal course of action is for officials to recuse themselves if they have a conflict of interest.

Geri Wasserman repeated that the Village should make a serious effort to adopt its guidelines into an ordinance so that developer know what is required of them. Commissioner Hellner said that each project is different and applying the same standards to all projects is difficult.

Commissioner Hellner stated that the Village has been more ambitious with respect to affordable housing since the housing market has improved. He commented on a recent study on the need for affordable housing in Cook County.

Mr. Firsel said that according to the housing authority website, voucher payments are greater than the maximum rents in the Village's guidelines. Commissioner Hellner said that whether vouchers are available is a different thing and CHA facilities have lengthy waiting lists.

Jim Elgas said that neighborhoods such as Virginia Terrace have been decimated by construction of new homes at the same time that the Village says it wants to protect affordable housing. He said the ability of people get a start in the community is going away. He said that it is a form of gentrification and the changes are upsetting to residents. He said that there have been many teardowns on his block and people are reluctant to improve their smaller homes because they think that resale is likely to be for a teardown.

Ted Eckhart asked when the public comment period will be ending because he is interested in listening to what the Housing Commissioners' are thinking. Commissioner Hellner asked if there were any more comments from the audience. When no one indicated they wished to speak, the public comment portion of the meeting ended.

Mr. Perkins provided a brief description of the differences between the developer's proposal and the staff's recommendations as well as the staff's reasoning. Mr. Perkins suggested adding people who work in Arlington Heights to the categories of persons who receive preference in tenancy.

Commissioner Creer asked for clarification on the process depending on whether the Housing Commission goes with the staff recommendation, the developer's proposal, its own recommendation, or if the Housing Commission is not able to arrive at a recommendation tonight. He asked how that will affect whether the project goes to the Village Board on May 6th. Mr. Perkins said that would have to be evaluated.

Mr. Firsel stated that he wished to provide the developer's responses to the staff recommendation for the record. He stated that they are asking that the income eligibility and rent levels be increased to the 80% AMI standards. The developer asks for a 20-year affordability period for the affordable units from the date of first occupancy instead of in perpetuity. The developer asks that the payment of fees in lieu of units take place at staggered points of permit and occupancy approval processes rather than all at once at first permit approval. He asked for flexibility in the number of studios and one-bedroom units by more or less 3 units (i.e. 3 – 9 studio units and 9 to 15 one-bedroom units but at all times a total of 18 affordable units) so that the developer has some flexibility in responding to unit demand. He also stated that they want to include all of the affordable units in the Campbell and Highland buildings, which will be the first buildings to be built. He asked that the annual report to the Village be due in March or April each year rather than January. He asked to go over the wording of the eighth recommendation.

Commissioner Tripp noted that the Village had requested more detailed financial information, but the developer said in February that a pro-forma was not available. He asked if that had changed. He said that it is difficult to make a decision based on the one spreadsheet that has been provided. Mr. Firsel stated that the estimated value in the staff report of \$204,000 to construct a unit is not accurate for this project. Mr. Perkins said that was not the intent of that number. The intent was to show the average value of this development's contribution based on housing in the Village is over \$3 million.

Zach Creer asked why the SB Friedman analysis had not been provided to the Housing Commission. Mr. Firsel clarified that SB Friedman did not provide an affordable housing analysis but they did provide a letter that the developer will send to staff stating that there are not a lot of communities in the area that have affordable housing policies. He said that the letter states that no developer, even developers that specialize in affordable housing for entire buildings and which received incentives or special financing, can develop at 60% AMI. Commissioner Hellner suggested that the number of units at 60% would need to be provided in order to evaluate whether that is accurate for a development. Housing Choice Vouchers is one way to

assist with the gap between the maximum rent to the tenant and what would be the market rent. Mr. Firsel stated that Ms. Boyer said she would assist with identifying ways to possibly address the gaps.

Commissioner Tripp asked about the origin of the preferences for tenant selection. The response was that staff first brought up the preferences but that developer was in agreement, wanting this to be a project that benefits Arlington Heights and its residents. Units would not be set aside and kept vacant if there were no applicants who qualify for preference. The assumption is that there will be many applications from the community.

Commissioner Creer stated that he is not seeing anything that would justify the developer's statements over the staff's recommendations. He said that he would even be willing to recommend more affordable units if other Housing Commissioners accept that. If the developer can show evidence of the developer's analysis, he would be willing to look at that, but he is disappointed by what is before him from the developer.

There was a discussion of the future property taxes on the development, which Mr. Firsel stated will be \$2 million/year including the residential, commercial, office and parking components. Tenants will rent parking spaces. Spaces are not included in the rents. Mr. Firsel stated that the property taxes on the units will be \$3,600 on average, and that property taxes on the affordable studio units will take up 36% of the annual rent received on those units.

Mr. Firsel said that the developer can look again at the income and rent limits and other alternatives but can not respond to alternatives tonight; and without having a discussion with the Village about possible assistance such as breaks on permit fees.

Mr. Adreani said that 60% AMI standard does not work and the banks will laugh them out when they go in for financing if that is presented. Mr. Firsel also said that the affordable housing affects the value of the property due to the annual loss in revenue for the affordable units. He said that this project is spearheading what the Village's requirements for affordable housing will be going forward and it has been challenging because up to this point what the Village has required has been all over the board. He said that it is important for the Village to have a program that is something it can be proud of, but the program needs to be realistic so that developments will not be made unfeasible.

Commissioner Delea asked about if more financial information is available since lender responses must be based on more information than the Housing Commission has. Mr. Firsel talked about the annual loss in rent at various numbers of units. Mr. Perkins pointed out the analysis in the Staff Report that shows annual gross rent income at approximately \$8 million and the rent losses at different levels equates to approximately 2% of the development's units. Mr. Firsel said the affordable housing also has an impact on the value of the property, which is based 100% on the project's income and talked about the capitalization required. Mr. Firsel talked about losses at 54 affordable units, but Mr. Delea said that information should not be presented based on 54 affordable units since that number of affordable units appears to be off the table. More information is needed at 18 or 20 units and 60% and 80% AMI. Mr. Firsel said other communities use other standards and there are other factors such as a Deerfield development that was approved at 120% AMI and Chicago developments where incentives, such as TIF funds, are included.

Commissioner Delea asked if Arlington Height has discussed moving its income eligibility standard to 80% AMI. Ms. Boyer responded that this has not been discussed. Commissioner Delea asked if the developer would consider a mix of 60% AMI and 80% AMI units. Mr. Perkins said that although Arlington Downs is providing 9 affordable units at 60% AMI, and more affordable units are being requested for Arlington 425, Arlington Downs did not get a break on the bedroom mix (the project includes two bedroom units) and Arlington Downs has parking construction costs. What is being asked of Arlington 425 is not that much more.

Mr. Firsell said that there may be some movement from 80% AMI to 75% AMI for, and they want to try to accommodate all parties. He suggested that it may turn out that a resolution that does not make anyone completely happy may be the best outcome. He said 27 actual affordable units is not something they can do.

Mr. Firsell asked that the Housing Commission deliberate and said that they will try to come to agreements where possible or may need to discuss and tweak requirements at the Village Board level too. There is a need, with financial implications, to move forward with the project.

In response to the developer's earlier comments, Mr. Perkins recommends that the affordable units to be affordable in perpetuity. Allocating the affordable units to the Campbell and Highland (and not Chestnut) buildings is fine. Staff does not have an issue with phasing in the payments of fees in lieu of units to points during the permit approval and first occupancy processes

Mr. Perkins said that staff understands that 15% affordable units is hard to get without affordable housing financing or programs. That is why the recommended percentage of affordable units was brought down to 5% for this privately-funded development. The 60% AMI standard is important for continued compliance with the 10% State affordable housing requirement. The recommended fee for 2.5% of the units brings the total contribution to 7.5% of all units. With respect to the staff point of view, it is also important that the units are affordable in perpetuity.

Commissioner Creer said that he would be willing to support the staff recommendation at this point and maybe go with a higher number of required units. He may have been more receptive to the developer's proposal had the developer provided more information justifying their proposal.

Mr. Firsell said that they would not be able to agree to additional affordable units tonight and without a discussion with the Village about assistance the Village could provide to reduce the developer's costs, cut as looking at waiving permit fees on the affordable units.

Commissioner Trip responded that the developers are saying that they need to do a holistic evaluation, and there are a lot of stakeholders who want this development to be a success. However, he said that the Housing Commission is being asked to make a decision with large implications based on not quite enough information. He said the Housing Commission needs more information just as the developer needs more information.

Commissioner Hellner said that throughout the process he has noted that everyone agrees that the Village would love to see this project. Mr. Firsell said that the project has a lot of moving parts that have been debated, but agrees that the project has been well received overall.

Commissioner Creer stated that the Housing Commission has a difficult role because considerations such as density, less parking, etc. are discussed prior to the project getting to the Housing Commission. The Housing Commission asks without having anything to offer. The only thing the Housing Commission has to work with is how much profit the developer should get. Mr. Firsel agreed that costly modifications have been requested throughout the process to this point and the affordable housing gets what is left over. He suggested that the process should include all components of the project all the way along, including the affordable housing, rather than leaving the affordable housing for the end.

Commissioner Delea said that he would like to see some units at 60% AMI. Commissioner Tripp agreed that he wants some units at 60% AMI but needs more information before making a recommendation.

Commissioner Creer said that he is inclined to go with the staff recommendation relying on staff's expertise.

Mr. Creer made a motion to accept the staff's recommendation for the affordable housing component of Arlington 425. The motion failed for a lack of second.

Commissioner Hellner said that the Housing Commission would like to get this resolved quickly for the developer and offered to put his suggestion of 18 units at 60% AMI and 9 units at 80% AMI in the form of a motion if the other Housing Commissioners were receptive to that. Mr. Firsel had said that the developer would not accept this alternative. There was no response from the Housing Commissioners and the motion was not made.

The possibility of meeting again before May 6th was discussed. Mr. Perkins said a turn around that quickly would be difficult, especially with regard to notifying the public, an available meeting room would have to be located, etc. Commissioner Creer asked when the developer could provide more financial information. It was clarified that the financial information requested is a detailed cash flow statement including anticipated revenues and expenses at the various affordable housing scenarios and showing the net operating income that is feeding the values.

Mr. Firsel said that he could provide the financial information to staff the next day and offered to meet with two Housing Commissioners at time (to comply with the Open Meetings Act), to go over financials. He said that some of the financial information is confidential and no developer that is not seeking public funds would disclose it. Mr. Perkins said staff would need to talk to the Village Attorney about such an approach.

Commissioner Creer stated he was not comfortable with the suggestion because he does not see it as the role of a citizen's advisory group to delve that deeply into the financials. He stated that he would be comfortable with staff doing that evaluation and amending the staff recommendations accordingly if they see fit.

Mr. Firsel asked if the needed additional analysis and discussion can be done over the next week in order to take the project to the Village Board on Monday, May 6th. Mr. Perkins said the Village will need to look at options for proceeding and when a next meeting can be scheduled.

Commissioner Hellner thanked everyone for attending and participating in the discussion.

VII. OTHER BUSINESS

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Commissioner Hellner, seconded by Commissioner Creer, to adjourn the meeting. The meeting adjourned at 10:10 pm.

NEXT MEETING: TO BE DETERMINED

Staff Report to the Housing Commission

To: The Chairman and Members of the Housing Commission
From: Nora Boyer, Housing Planner
Re: Arlington 425 – Response to Affordable Housing Guidelines
Report Prepared: April 25, 2019
Meeting Date: April 29, 2019

Background

Arlington 425 is a residential and commercial development proposed for the northern three quarters of vacant Block 425 located in downtown Arlington Heights. Block 425 is bounded by Campbell Street to the north, Sigwalt Street to the south, Highland Avenue to the east, and Chestnut Avenue to the west.

The proposed development would involve the construction of three buildings on the site; one building along Chestnut Avenue, one building along Campbell Street, and one building along Highland Avenue. The developer is proposing a four-story residential building on the Chestnut Avenue side of the site, a nine-story residential building with ground floor commercial space on the Campbell Street portion of the site, and a thirteen-story building with five floors of parking and residential units above on the Highland Avenue side of the site. The total number of residential units proposed in the three buildings is 361.

Affordable Housing Guidelines

The Village of Arlington Heights' affordable housing guidelines suggests that, in a rental development of this size (i.e. a development of 26 or more units), 15% of the units be affordable to households at or below 60% of Area Median Income (AMI) at affordable rents. Therefore, the guidelines call for 54 affordable units in this development ($361 \text{ total units} \times .15 = 54 \text{ affordable units}$).

Developer's Proposals

December 20, 2018 Letter - In their first formal response to the Village's affordable housing guidelines, the developer stated that they were "committed to promoting affordability in private housing within the Village." They further stated that due to the cost of development they would be unable to finance and ultimately sell the development with 54 affordable units. Instead, the developer committed to providing 15 affordable units in the development.

February 8, 2019 Letter - The developer provided additional details stating that the proposed 15 affordable units would be studio and one-bedroom units located in all three buildings. The developer further stated that they reserved the right to allocate the units among the buildings; that unit sizes would equate to the average unit types and sizes in each of the buildings; and the number of affordable units would be reduced to 13 if the building facing Chestnut is developed as a condominium project.

April 4, 2019 Letter - The developer's current response to the affordable housing guidelines states that they would provide actual affordable units and/or to provide payments in lieu (or a combination) equivalent to 27

units (rather than 54) with the actual number of units, payments in lieu of units, allocation of units among buildings; and other considerations to be discussed with the Housing Commission.

April 12, 2019 Meeting – Staff met with the developer at which time the developer proposed 27 units as follows:

1. 20 actual affordable units or 5.5% of total units in the development.
2. Income eligibility and rent levels affordable at 80% of Area Median Income (AMI).
3. That the affordable units all be studio and one-bedroom units.
4. A fee in lieu payment for 7 affordable units or 2% of total units in the development at \$25,000 per unit (\$175,000 total).

April 12, 2019 Meeting Referenced Above – Staff presented the following to the developer:

Staff Alternative Proposal

At the April 12, 2019 meeting referenced above, staff proposed 27 units in the following alternative:

1. 18 actual affordable units or 5% of total units in the development
2. Income eligibility and rent levels affordable at 60% of Area Median Income (AMI).
3. That the affordable units all be studio and one-bedroom units.
4. A fee in lieu payment for 9 affordable units or 2.5% of total units in the development at \$25,000 per unit (\$225,000 total).
5. Preference is to be given to current Arlington Heights residents and/or veterans.
6. If the affordable housing guidelines are revised in the future resulting in a lower requirement than what the developer and Village agree upon, the lower of the two standards would be applied going forward.

Analysis

The following issues have been identified when analyzing this and other affordable housing proposals under the Village's guidelines:

Cost of providing an affordable unit:

In evaluating the cost of providing actual affordable units, staff evaluated the 4 N. Hickory project, Arlington Downs, and an existing apartment building that was for sale and listed on Loop Net in the summer of 2018. On average, the cost to build or acquire apartment units ranges from \$157,000 to \$252,000 per unit (average \$204,500/unit). At the estimated value of \$204,500/unit, the value to purchase or build 18 affordable housing units is approximately \$3.7 million.

Financial impact on development/Loss of developer income:

Based on the \$2.32 monthly market rate rent per square foot of apartment spaces reported by the developer:

- Total estimated rent for the development annually: \$8,458,200
- Lost rent income for 20 units per the developer if 1/3 of the affordable units are studio units (7 units) and 2/3 are one-bedroom units (13 units) as shown below is \$188,148 or 2.2% of gross rental income per year.

Projected Market Rent vs. Rents Affordable at 60% AMI (2018)

	2019 Arlington Heights Max. Monthly Rent	Market Rate Rent at \$2.32 per sf	Difference in Rent per Month	# of Affordable units	Total Lost Rent per Month	Total Lost Rent per Year
Studio Unit	\$889	\$1,385	\$496	7	\$3,472	\$41,664
One-bedroom Unit	\$952	\$1,891	\$939	13	\$12,207	\$146,484
				20	\$15,679	\$188,148

*There may be programs available that could reduce the rent differentials.

Village Guidelines and Village Board Directives:

1. Negotiation and Emphasis on Inclusion of Affordable Units

As the Housing Commission is aware, the 15% affordable housing goal for larger developments as stated in the Village's guidelines has only been attained on a few occasions and usually by niche affordable housing developers that utilized multi-layered financing including government-sponsored affordable housing financing programs. The fee in lieu of affordable units of \$75,000/unit has never been attained, with the most common recently approved amount being \$25,000 per affordable unit. See the attached Inclusionary Affordable Housing Table for the history of units and fees approved to date.

The percentage threshold and fee amount are guidelines (both of which have been reduced from the original amounts). The Housing Commission and the Village Board have evaluated projects on a case-by-case basis to determine the number of affordable units that are feasible in each development given factors such as housing market conditions, land cost, construction cost and infrastructure needs. The Village has not yet adopted its guidelines by Code as it was recognized that every new development is subject to unique circumstances.

During this project's early review before the Village Board, and last summer when discussing other development projects, the Village Board made it clear that they wish to see actual units included within future rental developments. This preference is consistent with the guidelines as stated in the *Multi-Family Affordable Housing Toolkit for Rental Housing* that it distributed to developers:

"The construction of the affordable units is preferred. However, in lieu of providing affordable units as per the Village's guidelines above the suggested payment in lieu of providing the affordable units is \$75,000 per unit with the funds to be used by the Village exclusively to create and/or preserve affordable housing in the Village." (emphasis added)

Privately-financed developments have been unable to incorporate the number of affordable units or pay the fee in lieu amount as stated in the Village's guidelines; otherwise these privately-financed projects would not have been feasible and, as a result, no affordable units would have been created nor would contributions have been made to the Affordable Housing Trust Fund. Since the inception, the Village has modified its guidelines and the Housing Commission continues to evaluate and consider recommending adjustments to the guidelines with the goal to create affordable housing without inhibiting development. Over the past couple of years, the bar has been raised for the number of actual units and the fee in lieu amounts that are provided or required.

2. Income Eligibility Standard

The Village's guidelines directs affordable rental programs to households at or below 60% of AMI. The developer proposes an income eligibility standard to 80% AMI.

The two income eligibility levels, adjusted for household size, are:

Household Size	2018 Max. Income at 60% AMI	2018 Max. Income at 80% AMI
1	\$35,580	\$47,400
2	\$40,620	\$54,200
3	\$45,720	\$60,950
4	\$50,760	\$67,700

The Village's income eligibility standard is set at 60% AMI for the following reasons:

- The Illinois Affordable Housing Planning and Appeal Act which requires that 10% of Illinois communities' housing stock be affordable sets the income eligibility standard for affordable rental housing at 60% AMI. Therefore, units created that meet this standard contribute to the Village meeting the State-required units whereas units created to be affordable at 80% AMI would not.
- The 2013 *Homes for a Changing Region* report for Arlington Heights indicated that there is:
 - Insufficient rental housing units in Arlington Heights, at the current and projected demand, for renter households with annual incomes at or below \$35,000/year (in 2013 dollars), which is more consistent with the 60% AMI levels.
 - An excess of rental housing units in Arlington Heights, for current and projected demand, for renter households with annual incomes above \$35,000 - \$75,000 (in 2013 dollars), which is more consistent with the 80% AMI levels.
- As indicated below, the difference between the affordable monthly rent between the developer's market rate and monthly rent affordable at 80% AMI is a discounted rent but the difference between the market rate rent and rent affordable at 60% AMI provides a meaningful measure of affordability.

Projected Market Rent vs. 60% and 80% AMI (2018)

	Market Rate Rent/Month	Affordable Rent at 80% AMI/Month	Difference between Market Rent and Rent at 80% AMI/Month	Affordable Rent at 60% AMI/Month	Difference between Market Rent and Rent at 60% AMI/Month
Studio Unit	\$1,385	\$1,185	\$200	\$889	\$496
One-Bedroom Unit	\$1,891	\$1,270	\$621	\$952	\$939

*Affordable rents for a studio unit is calculated at 30% of maximum monthly income for a one-person household at 80% AMI and 60% AMI. Affordable rent for a one-bedroom unit is calculated at 30% of monthly maximum income for a 1.5 person household at 80% and 60% AMI. This is the method used by the Illinois Housing Development Authority.

For these reasons, staff believes that it is better have fewer units affordable at 60% of Area Median Income (AMI) rather than more affordable units at 80% of Area Median Income (AMI).

3. Unit Size Mix

The Village's guidelines call for the size (i.e. bedroom mix) and the standard interior finishes of the affordable units to be consistent with the market rate development. The guidelines also state that the affordable units are to be disbursed throughout the development.

The developer is proposing studio and one-bedroom units at a proportional mix but no two-bedroom units due to the larger rent differential

Of the studio and one-bedroom units proposed for Arlington 425, approximately 1/3 are studio units and 2/3 are one-bedroom units. Therefore, the bedroom mix of the affordable units should reflect these proportions and be disbursed throughout the Arlington 425 rental buildings.

Recommendation

After analyzing the cost of providing affordable units, financial impacts on the Arlington 425 developer, and the Village Boards goals and directives, it is recommended that the affordable housing component of Arlington 425 meet the following conditions:

1. 18 actual affordable units be provided (5% of all units), affordable at 60% Area Median Income (AMI) that are to be affordable in perpetuity.
2. A payment in lieu of 9 units (2.5% of all units) to be paid at \$25,000 per unit (\$225,000 total) at the time of permit issuance for the first building to be constructed at Arlington 425.
3. The income eligibility standard for the affordable units is to be 60% of the Area Median Income (AMI) for the Chicago-Joliet-Naperville area, adjusted for household size as updated annually by HUD.
4. The maximum rents are to be the rents determined to be affordable to households at 60% of Area Median Income (AMI) for the applicable unit sizes (studio and one-bedroom units) according to the method used by the Illinois Housing Development Authority (IHDA) for the Chicago Metro Area.

5. That 1/3 of the 18 affordable units will be studio units (6 studio units) and 2/3 of the affordable units will be one-bedroom units (12 one-bedroom units), which is consistent with the proportions of these units in the development.

6. Preference for tenancy of the affordable units will be given to current Arlington Heights residents and/or veterans.

7. The developer shall submit an annual report concerning compliance with the affordable housing program by January 31 of each year in a form as determined by the Village and in compliance with all other elements of the guidelines.

8. If the Village's affordable housing guidelines are revised prior to the issuance of the first building permit for this project to standards that are lower than what the developer and Village agree upon, that the lower of the two standards will be applied.

Additionally, it is recommended that the Housing Commission evaluate the guidelines and recommend modifications to address market conditions and eliminate future case-by-case negotiations.





MICHAEL D. FIRSEL
MICHAEL E. ROSS
CHRISTINE S. BOLGER
KAREN JERWOOD
STEPHEN E. ROSS

2801 LAKESIDE DRIVE, SUITE 207
BANNOCKBURN, IL 60015

O 847-582-9900
F 847-582-9933

www.firsellross.com

December 20, 2018

RECEIVED
DEC 21 2018
PLANNING & COMMUNITY
DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

Ms. Nora Boyer
Housing Planner
Housing Commission
Village of Arlington Heights
33 S. Arlington Heights Rd.
Arlington Heights, IL 60005-1403

**Re: Request for Affordable Housing Review by Housing Commission - Arlington 425 /
CCH LLC - Temporary File Number T1599**

Dear Nora:

Please consider this letter our formal request to present the affordable housing aspects of our proposed project, "Arlington 425", before the Housing Commission of the Village of Arlington Heights.

As you are aware, CCH LLC, the owner and developer of Arlington 425 (the "Owner"), is proposing a new mixed-use development on the parcel of vacant land identified as Block 425 in the Village of Arlington Heights Downtown Master Plan. I have been authorized to deliver this letter to the Village for and on behalf of the owner of the project (the "Project").

The Project will involve a new PUD consolidating seventeen lots into a single lot as well as the construction of three buildings containing a total of 361 residential dwelling units, currently planned as all "for-rent" apartments. One building will be located along Campbell Street and will contain nine stories, with commercial / office space on the first two floors and 182 apartment units on the top seven floors (42 studios, 91 one-bedroom and 49 two-bedroom). One building will be located along Highland Avenue, and will contain thirteen stories with the first floor reserved for commercial use, the next six floors will consist of a 454-space parking garage, and the final six floors containing 125 apartment units (101 of which will be one-bedroom and twenty-four of which will be two-bedroom). The third and final building is currently planned to be a four-story apartment building located along Chestnut Avenue containing fifty-four units (28 one-bedroom and 26 two-bedroom).

Ms. Norma Boyer
December 20, 2018
Page 2

The Project will be marketed at upper-middle class residents. Accordingly, a standard unit within the Project will likely not be affordable to the average lower-income individual. Nonetheless, our client intends to meet the Village's affordable housing requirements in a manner consistent with other current and previous developments within the Village.

Our client will provide handicap-accessible apartments in a reasonable quantity to meet potential tenants' needs. Although the exact number of handicap-accessible units has not yet been determined, we are currently conducting studies to ensure that the proper amount is provided, and we welcome input from the Village and Housing Commission as to this issue.

As to the number of affordable housing units within the Project, the Village currently requires that PUDs with twenty-six or more units contain 15% or more affordable housing units. This would require our client to provide 54 affordable housing units within the Project. While our client is committed to promoting the affordability of private housing within the Village, it is an unavoidable reality that the scale of this project and the size of the parcel to be developed will not allow our client to provide the full amount of fifty-four affordable housing units while still being able to finance the development and ultimately sell the Project. Based on the cost of development as well as the ultimate value of the project upon disposition, Owner simply cannot develop this Project and provide 54 affordable housing units.

Rather, our client is committed to providing 15 affordable housing units in the Project, and will otherwise comply with the remaining requirements of the Affordable Housing program.

We look forward to presenting this project before the Housing Commission for review, comment, and approval.

Sincerely,


Michael D. Firsell

MDF/djm



Village of Arlington Heights

33 South Arlington Heights Road
Arlington Heights, Illinois 60005-1499
(847) 368-5000
Website: www.vah.com

January 4, 2019

Mr. Michael D. Firsel
Firsel Ross – Attorneys at Law
2801 Lakeside Drive, Suite 207
Bannockburn, IL 60015

Re: Affordable Housing Proposal – Arlington 425 Project – Temp File No. T1599

Dear Mr. Firsel:

In your response, you state that "the size of the parcel to be developed will not allow our client to provide the full amount of fifty-four affordable housing Units while still being able to finance the development and ultimately sell the Project."

In order that the Village may evaluate your affordable housing proposal, the Village requests the following documents and answers to questions:

1. Provide a detailed financial pro forma to validate your statements that 54 affordable units are not financially feasible, and that no more than 15 affordable units are financially feasible.
2. Provide a breakdown of the 15 units you propose to provide by building. What are the square footage areas of each proposed affordable unit? Of the proposed 15 units, how many will be studio, 1-bedroom and 2-bedroom units?
3. Does the developer expect to use any federal or other affordable housing programs to subsidize the rents in the affordable units?

The Village looks forward to receiving your response. Please contact me at (847) 368-5214 or nboyer@vah.com if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Nora A. Boyer", is written over a horizontal line.

Nora A. Boyer
Housing Planner



MICHAEL D. FIRSELL
MICHAEL E. ROSS
CHRISTINE S. BOLGER
KAREN JERWOOD
STEPHEN E. ROSS

2801 LAKESIDE DRIVE, SUITE 207
BANNOCKBURN, IL 60015

O 847-582-9900

F 847-582-9933

www.firsellross.com

February 8, 2019

Ms. Nora Boyer
Housing Planner
Department of Planning and Community Development
Village of Arlington Heights
33 S. Arlington Heights Road
Arlington Heights, Illinois 60005

Re: Request for Housing Commission Review - Arlington 425 Development

Dear Ms. Boyer,

This letter is written in response to yours of January 4, 2019. The paragraph references below correspond to those contained in your letter.

1. We are unable to provide a "detailed financial proforma" at this time. The main reason is that we have not yet developed a detailed financial proforma because we do not have the approvals and other project requirements necessary to know what we are building and how we are building the project. Without accurate pricing which is integral to any detailed project financial proforma, the requested proforma cannot be completed. However, we have prepared, and I have attached a financial impact analysis of providing 1, 15 and 54 Affordable Housing units. This analysis indicates what the financial impact on both the project's cash flow and sale value will be. Based on the developer's 40+ years of experience in the industry, this project is not viable based on (a) the loss of annual income necessary to secure a financeable debt service coverage ratio; and (b) the ultimate market value of the development which value is primarily a function of a capitalization of the project's income stream. The project is hardly viable with even the 15 Affordable Units, but the Developer is committed to providing the number of Affordable units proposed. We request that you to review this analysis.

2. The proposed 15 Affordable Housing units would consist of studio and one-bedroom apartments located in all three buildings. The Developer would reserve the right to allocate the units among the buildings. The unit sizes will equate to the average unit types and sizes in each of the buildings. Were the Chestnut building to be developed as a condominium



Ms. Nora Boyer
February 8, 2019
Page 2

project. the number of Affordable units would be reduced to 13 units between the Highland and Campbell buildings.

3. We have not yet investigated the availability of additional sources of income to supplement the loss of income from the Affordable Housing units. However, if available, we will likely pursue such availability.

In addition, we have studied the historical Affordable Housing requests and requirements for the developments in the Village to date. Based on our review of that information, we believe that the proposed number of Affordable Housing units is consistent with past and current Village practices.

Based on this response to your request for further information, we request a meeting with staff as soon as possible to review and further discuss our proposal, so we can move to a Housing Commission hearing as quickly as possible.

Thank you for your cooperation and consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads 'Michael D. Firsell'. The signature is written in a cursive style.

Michael D. Firsell

MDF/djm

CCH LLC - AFFORDABLE HOUSING												
CASH FLOW AND VALUE COST												
I Unit	avg sf	rent sf	avg rent/mo	max for 2018	lost rent	# units	mo loss	loss/unit/yr	Annual Cash Flow Loss	Value loss		
										5 years	10 years	20 years
1-br	815	\$ 2.32	\$ 1,891	\$ 952	\$ 939	1	\$ 939	\$ 11,266				
									\$ 11,266			
										\$ 56,328.00		
											\$ 112,656	
												\$ 225,312
15 Units Proposed												
Studio	597	\$ 2.32	\$ 1,385	\$ 889	\$ 496	8	\$ 3,968	\$ 47,620				
1-br	815	\$ 2.32	\$ 1,891	\$ 952	\$ 939	7	\$ 6,572	\$ 78,859				
									\$ 126,479			
										\$ 632,395	\$ 1,264,790	\$ 2,529,581
54 Units - Per Code												
Studio	597	\$ 2.32	\$ 1,385	\$ 889	\$ 496	27	\$ 13,393	\$ 160,717				
1-br	815	\$ 2.32	\$ 1,891	\$ 952	\$ 939	27	\$ 25,348	\$ 304,171				
									\$ 464,888			
										\$ 2,324,441	\$ 4,648,882	\$ 9,297,763



MICHAEL D. FIRSEL
MICHAEL E. ROSS
CHRISTINE S. BOLGER
KAREN JERWOOD
STEPHEN E. ROSS

2801 LAKESIDE DRIVE, SUITE 207
BANNOCKBURN, IL 60015

O 847-582-9900
F 847-582-9933

www.firsellross.com

April 4, 2019

Mr. Alex Hageli, Chairman, and
members of the Village of Arlington Heights
Housing Commission
33 S. Arlington Heights Road
Arlington Heights, Illinois 60005

**Re: REVISED - Affordable Housing Proposal - Arlington 425 Development -
PC #19-001**

Dear Mr. Hageli,

This letter is written as a revised proposal by the Petitioner for the provision of affordable housing units at Arlington 425. Based on Petitioner's 40+ years of experience in the development industry, this project is not viable with the inclusion of 54 affordable housing units based on (a) the loss of annual income necessary to secure a financing; and (b) the ultimate market value of the development which is primarily a function of a capitalization of the project's net income. **Petitioner will agree to provide a total of 27 affordable housing units.**

The allocation of the actual number of units to be leased or payment in lieu, the allocation amongst the buildings, and other related issues can be discussed and resolved with the Housing Commission in person.

We have studied the historical affordable housing requests and requirements for the developments in the Village to date. Based on our review of that information, we believe that the proposed number of affordable housing units meets and exceeds previous Village practices and policies.

We request a hearing with the entire Housing Commission as soon as possible to review and further discuss our proposal, and arrive at a mutually acceptable recommendation to the Village Board.

Thank you for your cooperation and consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,

Michael D. Firsell

INCLUSIONARY AFFORDABLE HOUSING TABLE

Last updated: 4/24/2019

Year	Development	Total Number of Units in the Development	<u>Required</u> Number of Affordable Units as per the Village guidelines	Number of Affordable Units included in the <u>Approved</u> Projects	Cost Offsets	Fee-in-Lieu Contributions
2004	Timber Court for-sale condominiums	108 units for sale condominiums approved 72 units have been constructed	21 units (20% of all 108 units) $108 \times .20 = 21$ affordable units	Approved: 21 affordable units (20% as required by policy). Seven (7) in each of 3 buildings. Two (2) buildings have been constructed with a total of 14 units affordable units (7 in each of the 2 buildings.	Density Bonus \$100,000 in Village paid road improvements	\$0
2011	Arlington Downs rental apartments	Up to 475 rental units in Phase II	95 units (20% of all 475 units) $475 \times .20 = 95$ affordable units	Approved: Up to 24 affordable units First 300 units: 0%. If more than 300 units are developed up to an estimated maximum of 475 units are constructed, 5% of all units in Phase II would be affordable. $475 \text{ max total units in Phase II} \times .05 = 24$ affordable units	None	The owners had the option of paying a fee in lieu of affordable units at the rate of \$100,000 for each affordable unit not provided. The developer was given the option to do a combination of affordable units and payment of the fee. (Amended for 263 unit ADR II building, see below).
2012	Arbor Lane for sale townhomes	16 townhomes	2 townhomes (12% of all 16 units) $16 \times .12 = 2$ affordable townhomes	Approved: 0 townhomes (see fee-in-lieu)	None	Fee-in-lieu payment : \$30,378 5% of the average sale price when half of the units (8 units) are sold or the average sale price of the units sold one year from the date of the first occupancy permit (which was issued on November 19, 2014), whichever comes first.
2014	Parkview Apartments rental apartments	45 rental apartments	7 units (15% of all 45 units) $45 \times .15 = 7$ affordable units	Approved: 7 units shall be maintained as affordable in perpetuity. Additional affordable units are included in the project in connection with affordable housing program financing of the project. It is reported that 41 of the 45 units are affordable.	None	\$0
2016	Lexington Homes – for sale townhomes	48 for-sale townhomes	7 affordable units (15% of all 48 units) $48 \times .15 = 7$	0 affordable units (see fee-in-lieu)	None	In lieu of providing 7 affordable units, the developer will pay a fee equal to \$2,500 for each of the 48 units in the development or \$17,142 per affordable unit for a total of \$120,000.

2017	Heart's Place	18 rental apartments for persons with disabilities	2 affordable units (10% of all 18 units) 18 x .10 = 2 affordable units	Approved: The project was proposed as a 100% affordable building. All 18 units are affordable.	None	The development is supportive housing for persons with disabilities. All 18 units (100%) are affordable.
2017	Sigwalt Apartments	86 rental apartments	13 units (15% of all 86 units) 86 x .15 = 13 affordable units	0 affordable units (see fee-in-lieu)	Density increase from approximately 60 units to 86 units.	\$325,000 or \$25,000 per affordable unit not provided. \$25,000 x 13 = \$325,000. This equates to approximately \$3,780 spread across all 86 units. The proposal was revised to 80 units which would have required 12 affordable units x \$25,000 = \$300,000. The project was not approved by the Village Board for reasons other than the affordable housing aspect of the project
2018	4 N. Hickory Hickory/Kensington Apartments	75 rental units	11 units (15% of all 75 units) 75 x .15 = 11 affordable units	None	Various variations requested. TIF assistance.	The Housing Commission accepted the petitioner's offer to pay a fee in lieu of affordable units of \$25,000 per affordable unit not provided in the development: 11 x \$25,000 = \$275,000. Approved by Village Board 7/16/18.
2018	Arlington Downs – Proposed amendment of affordable housing requirement (2018)	Phase II 263 rental units referred to by the developer as ADR II. (180 senior units are informally referred to in the plans but not proposed at this time – i.e. ADR III).	Phase II total 40 units (15% of all 263 units) 263 x .15 = 40 affordable units 13 (5%) affordable units was approved in 2011 – see above	9 affordable units	Various variations.	Following strong direction from the Village Board that the inclusion of affordable units is favored by the Village Board rather than satisfaction of the requirement through payment of the fee, the approved requirements is: 9 affordable housing units in ADR II and fee in the amount of \$25,000 each for 4 affordable units not provided (i.e. \$100,000).



MICHAEL D. FIRSEL
MICHAEL E. ROSS
CHRISTINE S. BOLGER
KAREN JERWOOD
STEPHEN E. ROSS

2801 LAKESIDE DRIVE, SUITE 207
BANNOCKBURN, IL 60015

O 847-582-9900
F 847-582-9933

www.firsellross.com

December 20, 2018

RECEIVED
DEC 21 2018
PLANNING & COMMUNITY
DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

Ms. Nora Boyer
Housing Planner
Housing Commission
Village of Arlington Heights
33 S. Arlington Heights Rd.
Arlington Heights, IL 60005-1403

**Re: Request for Affordable Housing Review by Housing Commission - Arlington 425 /
CCH LLC - Temporary File Number T1599**

Dear Nora:

Please consider this letter our formal request to present the affordable housing aspects of our proposed project, "Arlington 425", before the Housing Commission of the Village of Arlington Heights.

As you are aware, CCH LLC, the owner and developer of Arlington 425 (the "Owner"), is proposing a new mixed-use development on the parcel of vacant land identified as Block 425 in the Village of Arlington Heights Downtown Master Plan. I have been authorized to deliver this letter to the Village for and on behalf of the owner of the project (the "Project").

The Project will involve a new PUD consolidating seventeen lots into a single lot as well as the construction of three buildings containing a total of 361 residential dwelling units, currently planned as all "for-rent" apartments. One building will be located along Campbell Street and will contain nine stories, with commercial / office space on the first two floors and 182 apartment units on the top seven floors (42 studios, 91 one-bedroom and 49 two-bedroom). One building will be located along Highland Avenue, and will contain thirteen stories with the first floor reserved for commercial use, the next six floors will consist of a 454-space parking garage, and the final six floors containing 125 apartment units (101 of which will be one-bedroom and twenty-four of which will be two-bedroom). The third and final building is currently planned to be a four-story apartment building located along Chestnut Avenue containing fifty-four units (28 one-bedroom and 26 two-bedroom).



Ms. Norma Boyer
December 20, 2018
Page 2

The Project will be marketed at upper-middle class residents. Accordingly, a standard unit within the Project will likely not be affordable to the average lower-income individual. Nonetheless, our client intends to meet the Village's affordable housing requirements in a manner consistent with other current and previous developments within the Village.

Our client will provide handicap-accessible apartments in a reasonable quantity to meet potential tenants' needs. Although the exact number of handicap-accessible units has not yet been determined, we are currently conducting studies to ensure that the proper amount is provided, and we welcome input from the Village and Housing Commission as to this issue.

As to the number of affordable housing units within the Project, the Village currently requires that PUDs with twenty-six or more units contain 15% or more affordable housing units. This would require our client to provide 54 affordable housing units within the Project. While our client is committed to promoting the affordability of private housing within the Village, it is an unavoidable reality that the scale of this project and the size of the parcel to be developed will not allow our client to provide the full amount of fifty-four affordable housing units while still being able to finance the development and ultimately sell the Project. Based on the cost of development as well as the ultimate value of the project upon disposition, Owner simply cannot develop this Project and provide 54 affordable housing units.

Rather, our client is committed to providing 15 affordable housing units in the Project, and will otherwise comply with the remaining requirements of the Affordable Housing program.

We look forward to presenting this project before the Housing Commission for review, comment, and approval.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads 'Michael D. Firsell'.

Michael D. Firsell

MDF/djm



Village of Arlington Heights

33 South Arlington Heights Road
Arlington Heights, Illinois 60005-1499
(847) 368-5000
Website: www.vah.com

January 4, 2019

Mr. Michael D. Firsel
Firsel Ross – Attorneys at Law
2801 Lakeside Drive, Suite 207
Bannockburn, IL 60015

Re: Affordable Housing Proposal – Arlington 425 Project – Temp File No. T1599

Dear Mr. Firsel:

In your response, you state that "the size of the parcel to be developed will not allow our client to provide the full amount of fifty-four affordable housing Units while still being able to finance the development and ultimately sell the Project."

In order that the Village may evaluate your affordable housing proposal, the Village requests the following documents and answers to questions:

1. Provide a detailed financial pro forma to validate your statements that 54 affordable units are not financially feasible, and that no more than 15 affordable units are financially feasible.
2. Provide a breakdown of the 15 units you propose to provide by building. What are the square footage areas of each proposed affordable unit? Of the proposed 15 units, how many will be studio, 1-bedroom and 2-bedroom units?
3. Does the developer expect to use any federal or other affordable housing programs to subsidize the rents in the affordable units?

The Village looks forward to receiving your response. Please contact me at (847) 368-5214 or nboyer@vah.com if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Nora A. Boyer", is written over a horizontal line.

Nora A. Boyer
Housing Planner



MICHAEL D. FIRSELL
MICHAEL E. ROSS
CHRISTINE S. BOLGER
KAREN JERWOOD
STEPHEN E. ROSS

2801 LAKESIDE DRIVE, SUITE 207
BANNOCKBURN, IL 60015

O 847-582-9900

F 847-582-9933

www.firsellross.com

February 8, 2019

Ms. Nora Boyer
Housing Planner
Department of Planning and Community Development
Village of Arlington Heights
33 S. Arlington Heights Road
Arlington Heights, Illinois 60005

Re: Request for Housing Commission Review - Arlington 425 Development

Dear Ms. Boyer,

This letter is written in response to yours of January 4, 2019. The paragraph references below correspond to those contained in your letter.

1. We are unable to provide a "detailed financial proforma" at this time. The main reason is that we have not yet developed a detailed financial proforma because we do not have the approvals and other project requirements necessary to know what we are building and how we are building the project. Without accurate pricing which is integral to any detailed project financial proforma, the requested proforma cannot be completed. However, we have prepared, and I have attached a financial impact analysis of providing 1, 15 and 54 Affordable Housing units. This analysis indicates what the financial impact on both the project's cash flow and sale value will be. Based on the developer's 40+ years of experience in the industry, this project is not viable based on (a) the loss of annual income necessary to secure a financeable debt service coverage ratio; and (b) the ultimate market value of the development which value is primarily a function of a capitalization of the project's income stream. The project is hardly viable with even the 15 Affordable Units, but the Developer is committed to providing the number of Affordable units proposed. We request that you to review this analysis.

2. The proposed 15 Affordable Housing units would consist of studio and one-bedroom apartments located in all three buildings. The Developer would reserve the right to allocate the units among the buildings. The unit sizes will equate to the average unit types and sizes in each of the buildings. Were the Chestnut building to be developed as a condominium



Ms. Nora Boyer
February 8, 2019
Page 2

project. the number of Affordable units would be reduced to 13 units between the Highland and Campbell buildings.

3. We have not yet investigated the availability of additional sources of income to supplement the loss of income from the Affordable Housing units. However, if available, we will likely pursue such availability.

In addition, we have studied the historical Affordable Housing requests and requirements for the developments in the Village to date. Based on our review of that information, we believe that the proposed number of Affordable Housing units is consistent with past and current Village practices.

Based on this response to your request for further information, we request a meeting with staff as soon as possible to review and further discuss our proposal, so we can move to a Housing Commission hearing as quickly as possible.

Thank you for your cooperation and consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads 'Michael D. Firsell'.

Michael D. Firsell

MDF/djm

CCH LLC - AFFORDABLE HOUSING												
CASH FLOW AND VALUE COST												
I Unit	avg sf	rent sf	avg rent/mo	max for 2018	lost rent	# units	mo loss	loss/unit/yr	Annual Cash Flow Loss	Value loss		
										5 years	10 years	20 years
1-br	815	\$ 2.32	\$ 1,891	\$ 952	\$ 939	1	\$ 939	\$ 11,266				
									\$ 11,266			
										\$ 56,328.00		
											\$ 112,656	
												\$ 225,312
15 Units Proposed												
Studio	597	\$ 2.32	\$ 1,385	\$ 889	\$ 496	8	\$ 3,968	\$ 47,620				
1-br	815	\$ 2.32	\$ 1,891	\$ 952	\$ 939	7	\$ 6,572	\$ 78,859				
									\$ 126,479			
										\$ 632,395	\$ 1,264,790	\$ 2,529,581
54 Units - Per Code												
Studio	597	\$ 2.32	\$ 1,385	\$ 889	\$ 496	27	\$ 13,393	\$ 160,717				
1-br	815	\$ 2.32	\$ 1,891	\$ 952	\$ 939	27	\$ 25,348	\$ 304,171				
									\$ 464,888			
										\$ 2,324,441	\$ 4,648,882	\$ 9,297,763



MICHAEL D. FIRSEL
MICHAEL E. ROSS
CHRISTINE S. BOLGER
KAREN JERWOOD
STEPHEN E. ROSS

2801 LAKESIDE DRIVE, SUITE 207
BANNOCKBURN, IL 60015

O 847-582-9900

F 847-582-9933

www.firsellross.com

April 4, 2019

Mr. Alex Hageli, Chairman, and
members of the Village of Arlington Heights
Housing Commission
33 S. Arlington Heights Road
Arlington Heights, Illinois 60005

**Re: REVISED - Affordable Housing Proposal - Arlington 425 Development -
PC #19-001**

Dear Mr. Hageli,

This letter is written as a revised proposal by the Petitioner for the provision of affordable housing units at Arlington 425. Based on Petitioner's 40+ years of experience in the development industry, this project is not viable with the inclusion of 54 affordable housing units based on (a) the loss of annual income necessary to secure a financing; and (b) the ultimate market value of the development which is primarily a function of a capitalization of the project's net income. **Petitioner will agree to provide a total of 27 affordable housing units.**

The allocation of the actual number of units to be leased or payment in lieu, the allocation amongst the buildings, and other related issues can be discussed and resolved with the Housing Commission in person.

We have studied the historical affordable housing requests and requirements for the developments in the Village to date. Based on our review of that information, we believe that the proposed number of affordable housing units meets and exceeds previous Village practices and policies.

We request a hearing with the entire Housing Commission as soon as possible to review and further discuss our proposal, and arrive at a mutually acceptable recommendation to the Village Board.

Thank you for your cooperation and consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,

Michael D. Firsell



MINUTES

President and Board of Trustees
Village of Arlington Heights
Board Room

Arlington Heights Village Hall
33 S. Arlington Heights Road
Arlington Heights, IL 60005

October 1, 2018

8:00 PM

I. CALL TO ORDER

II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

III. ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS

President Hayes and the following Trustees responded to roll: Scaletta, Sidor, Baldino, LaBedz, Blackwood, Glasgow, Tinaglia and Rosenberg.

Also present were: Randy Recklaus, Charles Perkins, Robin Ward, Diana Mikula, Gerald Mourning and Becky Hume

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

XIV. REPORT OF THE VILLAGE MANAGER

A. Arlington 425 Development - Early Review

Mr. Recklaus said this is an Early Review of the proposed Arlington 425 project. No final decisions will occur this evening. The intent of Early Review is to help the developers gauge the Board's thoughts prior to bringing a project forward. Early Review does not commit the Board to

approve or deny a proposal. The Plan Commission and Design Commission reviews will still occur. Staff has reviewed the proposal and met with each trustee on this project. The petitioner has held two neighborhood meetings to obtain resident feedback. This is the first time the Board will have the opportunity to publicly discuss the issue.

Trustee Tinaglia said his firm is the architectural firm on this project, so he is recusing himself from the discussion. He left the room.

Mike Firsel, attorney for the project, said there are 18 separate lots, most of which are zoned B-5, a few are zoned R-3. The Master Development Plan shows the zoning as B-5. The owner, CCH LLC, is proposing 3 separate buildings. Feedback has been received from staff, Mr. Recklaus and the community. Eight hundred and thirty taxpayers were sent invitations to a neighborhood meeting and the Chamber of Commerce members were invited. The most sensitive point brought forward was parking. There will be a 450 car parking deck and an underground parking lot for the Chestnut building for a total of 548 spots. Under code they are required to have 385.

Mr. Firsel said CCH is not requesting a height variance or a density variance. The village's Vail Street garage is built to their property line. They believe the lots currently zoned as R-3 should be rezoned to B-5 because they abut B-5 lots. Loading is a concern, so they have employed a property manager to advise them on garbage and loading areas. There is a pull-in loading area on Chestnut for that particular building. All access to the parking deck will be off Highland. There will be a right turn only out onto Chestnut. They are requesting to not put retail in the Chestnut building even though it is B-5, as it is across from single family homes. There is an 8' dedicated setback on Chestnut so they will ask for a variance for squaring off the land on the south side of that lot. The Campbell Street building has 172 units and 8 floors. The Chestnut Avenue building is 5 floors. There is a website set up for public comments and questions. All move ins/out will occur interior to the property. They will have plenty of retail parking and guest parking. Valet parking would be encouraged for any restaurant.

Mr. Perkins said this project requires a PUD. Four parcels require rezoning from R-3 to B-5. There are a few variations regarding the elimination of commercial on first floor of Chestnut, loading and spaces. These will be flushed out in the review process. The Comprehensive Plan shows the area to be mixed-use. In the 70's high-density residential was zoned all the way to Ridge Ave. In the 80's the southern portion was changed to B-5. Then later it was changed to high-density residential. This part of the village has had a contraction in high-density uses over the years.

President Hayes said this is Early Review, so tonight is an opportunity for the Board to provide input to the developer. The Board is not committing to this project one way or the other. There is a long way to go. The audience/community will have plenty of opportunities to provide input.

President Hayes said he appreciated the outreach to the community. When he first saw the plans, he thought wow, this is huge. It's bold and exciting. The developer is willing to invest millions of dollars in the village. He was enthused about what has been presented so far. He said he would encourage the developer to put a restaurant on top of the larger building. It would provide an additional draw to the area.

Trustee LaBedz wished the Chestnut building was 4 stories versus 5 but liked the design of the building. She was glad to hear there is enough parking for guests and patrons of the retail establishments, so no additional strain is felt on the streets or in the Vail garage. She asked about the traffic circulation on the interior of the development. Mr. Firsell said cars will come off of Highland from one of the two entrances to the parking garage. One of the entrances will also access the interior drive. There are drop-offs at each building. They will need to take three parking spots on the west side of Highland for their second entrance. The interior capacity can hold a fire truck to service all the buildings. The ingress/egress for the underground parking at the Chestnut building will be on the south side of that building and is limited to one access point. The Highland and Campbell buildings each have loading areas separate from the Chestnut loading area. The entrance for residential on Campbell will be at the rear of the building, not where the retail space is.

CCH is planning to construct this as one owner, with one management contact for all three of the buildings. If the buildings are sold off separately, they would make the necessary arrangements for access and easements. Mr. Firsell said there have been inquiries as to if there will be condos. If they did have condos, they would be in the Chestnut Avenue building but they are studying that. Mr. Perkins said staff can put language in the PUD to make them come back before the Board to request a transition into condos.

Trustee LaBedz said the Highland/Sigwalt/Campbell intersections are dicey. Mr. Perkins said this will be analyzed. A midblock crosswalk is being designed on Campbell between Highland and Vail which will have impact. Trustee LaBedz asked if the new garage would limit maintenance access to the Vail garage. Mr. Perkins said staff is in discussions with them to ensure garage will be compatible from a maintenance standpoint. Trustee LaBedz asked about the reflectivity of the west windows. Mr. Firsell said the glass will be non-reflective. The glass starts at the 6th floor, high above any homes. Architect Kelle Bruckbauer said the glass will softly reflect the sky. Trustee LaBedz asked about electrical service. Mr. Perkins said ComEd said they can provide sufficient service to the site. ComEd will review the detailed plans and make any necessary changes. Trustee LaBedz thanked CCH for the commitment to affordable housing. Mr. Firsell said they are committed to affordable housing but this is not the final number of unit counts.

Trustee Blackwood asked for clarification on the Chestnut building parking. Mr. Firsell said all parking for that building will be in its own underground

lot. That is why it might be more adaptable to a condo development. The first floor of the building is all apartments, no retail. Trustee Blackwood asked about solar energy. Mr. Firsel said they have interviewed two general contractors and will be addressing some of these issues. They will not build a project unless they know they will have adequate electrical service. All of the storm water detention will be underground on site. He said they would look at solar power.

Trustee Sidor asked if the entrance to the garage on Highland matched up with the village's egress to the Vail Street garage. Mr. Perkins said the egresses need to be studied carefully to make sure they work. Trustee Sidor said there are already truck traffic and safety issues on Highland Avenue. As a village, we need to figure this out, or it will be a mess on Highland. He said he liked the glass on a building that size because it lightens it. If it was all brick it would look too heavy. He wished the Chestnut street building was lower but liked the look of it. He said he liked the project as it will differentiate the village from others along the corridor.

Trustee Baldino said he got more comfortable with the size of the project the more he looked at it. It seems right sized. The lack of request for variances shows that it fits the property. It's a good, well thought out design. He said he was a little uncomfortable with the number of stories on Chestnut. He was encouraged by the commitment to affordable housing. Mr. Perkins said there would be 54 affordable units if code were followed. Trustee Baldino said if we get close to that, it would be phenomenal. He was encouraged by the storm water detention and the possibility of solar energy. At this point, he was excited and encouraged.

Trustee Rosenberg said he thought it was great from the get go. It's sized right with good parking. He had some concerns on egress/ingress on Highland and circulation with deliveries and issues there. Those things need to be worked out. He asked about security in the parking lot. Mr. Firsel said it will be gated with a key card. They will consult with a parking deck company who has sophisticated software and technology for addressing guest and retail parking. Trustee Rosenberg agrees with trying to get a top deck restaurant. He asked about making Highland one way. Mr. Firsel said he didn't know about that. The residents of the buildings will most likely prefer to enter from Sigwalt versus off of Campbell. Trustee Rosenberg directed Mr. Perkins to think about making Highland one way or address the issue somehow.

Trustee Glasgow said he did not have a problem with the R-3 lots changing to B-5. He confirmed with Mr. Firsel that there would not be any retail on Chestnut. Trustee Glasgow said the downtown businesses want this. He asked how many retail establishments would be in these buildings. Mr. Firsel said they are imagining destination retail or co/working spaces with perhaps outdoor dining on the corner. 18,000 square feet of retail space is available, so there could be 5-8 different retailers or uses. They would like a steakhouse or something upscale for the top floor restaurant. Between 600 and 800 people will live here. It would be nice to have co/working

space to keep people in town to patronize the local restaurants for lunch.

Trustee Glasgow asked about overflow parking at the Vail Garage. Mr. Recklaus said they will be able to provide that detail on October 22 at the Committee of the Whole meeting when the parking study is presented. Trustee Glasgow said he will be looking for parking solutions. He was pleased with the addition of affordable housing. He said he had concerns regarding the massing and transition to a residential area. The Highland building is big and has a lot of glass. It will put a lot of pressure on the infrastructure. He asked if it will block views. Mr. Firsel said the eastern side is over a parking deck, so it has no immediate impact to the east. The common area is going to be expansive and a park like setting. He said he didn't see how sunlight would be blocked out, and the zoning calls for this size. Trustee Glasgow said they did a nice job buffering the traffic flow and liked the green space which adds to the joy of living in the downtown. Those are nice factors. The delivery truck issues are real. He liked the underground parking on Chestnut.

Mr. Firsel said they would construct the Highland and Campbell buildings first within two years, and then build the Chestnut building last. It will depend on demand for apartments and leasing numbers. The third building will start after the first two are complete to help with staging and so as not to disturb the neighbors even more. Trustee Glasgow said to think about if the area becomes pedestrian-only on occasion.

Trustee Scaletta said on Highland there is retail and restaurants. On Campbell, there is retail and a grand entryway. The lobby goes all the way through the building. So, the lobby is surrounded by retail on either side, including what faces Chestnut. Trustee Scaletta said people will use the lobby on the Campbell side for drop offs and entrance/exiting. The interior circle will be gridlock central. The biggest challenge will be circulation into the garage. The entry to the center is across from the loading dock of the Metropolis Lofts and the village garage. There's a lot of gridlock there. He said he was concerned that they are putting too much on the property. There is not enough room to circulate for residents/move ins/deliveries. He urged them to have the traffic people look at the traffic and he will focus on that. He wants to know where dogs will be allowed and if the interior green space was open to the public. He said he will ask how they intend to make the outdoor space safe. He was not opposed to the glass on the Highland building but he prefers a little framing. The Highland building will be 12.5 stories.

Trustee Scaletta asked about the southern boarder lot lines. Mr. Perkins said the distance between CCH's buildings and the proposed CCA building would have been 18' on the east side and 33' on the west side. Trustee Scaletta said he will be looking for underground detention. Mr. Firsel said guests to the Chestnut building would park underground. They will charge residents for parking, but not retail users or guests. Trustee Scaletta suggested they provide a rendering showing the shadow effect.

Resident Keith Moens said not all Board members commented on the affordable housing and he would like the affordable housing to go through. He asked if there was some way to provide a schedule for the commission process. Mr. Recklaus said given the interest on this project, social media will be used to communicate to the public. All meetings are posted on the village's website as well. The timing depends on how the petitioner comes forward. The project will go through the Conceptual Review Committee, the Plan Commission Public Hearing, Design Commission and the Housing Commission. All surrounding properties owners will receive written notices regarding the Public Hearing and there will be a sign on the property. Mr. Moens asked for the Board to communicate to the commissions that they want the maximum affordable housing units with no buyouts.

President Hayes said he didn't mention affordable housing earlier because in CCH's materials they committed to the units versus a cash in lieu of scenario.

Trustee Rosenberg asked if staff could create an area on the village website that shows the timetable of the project as it progresses, understanding it is dependent upon the petitioner's submissions and responses.

Mr. Recklaus said the website could have a section dedicated to this with a date range outlined. He said he would hesitate projecting hard dates, because things can get delayed for various reasons.

Mr. Firsel said CCH will put their information on their website and could link to the village website. He offered their website as a point of contact for the community.

XV. APPOINTMENTS

XVI. PETITIONS AND COMMUNICATIONS

XVII. ADJOURNMENT

Trustee John Scaletta moved to adjourn at 10:13 p.m. Trustee Bert Rosenberg Seconded the Motion.

The Motion: Passed

Ayes: Baldino, Blackwood, Glasgow, Hayes, LaBedz, Rosenberg, Scaletta, Sidor

Absent: Tinaglia

APPROVED

MINUTES OF
THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS
DESIGN COMMISSION MEETING
HELD AT THE ARLINGTON HEIGHTS MUNICIPAL BUILDING
33 S. ARLINGTON HEIGHTS RD.
MARCH 12, 2019

Chair Fitzgerald called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

Members Present: John Fitzgerald, Chair
Scott Seyer
Kirsten Kingsley
Ted Eckhardt
Jonathan Kubow

Members Absent: None

Also Present: Robert Losselyoung, Tinaglia Architects for *Arlington Block 425*
Kelle Bruckbauer, Tinaglia Architects for *Arlington Block 425*
Steve Ross, Firsell Ross LLC for *Arlington Block 425*
Edin Lepuzanovic for *924 N. Walnut Ave.*
Heather Moss & Matt Shimkus, Owners of *915 N. Walnut Ave.*
Joe & Jon Zivoli, for the *Elm Shopping Center*
Steve Hautzinger, Staff Liaison

REVIEW OF MEETING MINUTES FROM FEBRUARY 26, 2019

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER KUBOW, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, TO APPROVE THE MEETING MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 26, 2019. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED.

ITEM 1. CBD MIXED-USE RE-REVIEWDC#18-104 – Arlington Block 425

Robert Losselyoung and Kelle Bruckbauer, representing *Tinaglia Architects*, and Steve Ross, representing *Firsel Ross LLC*, were present on behalf of the project.

Mr. Hautzinger presented Staff comments. The petitioner is seeking approval of the proposed architectural designs for three new multi-story apartment buildings in the Downtown. This is the design review portion of the approval process, with the zoning to be discussed at the Plan Commission review on March 27, 2019. Because this project is going to the Plan Commission, the role of the Design Commission is limited to the review of the building and signage only tonight.

This project received a preliminary Design Commission review on December 11, 2018 and a formal Design Commission review on February 12, 2019, at which time the project was continued to allow design concerns to be further studied and addressed by the petitioner. Highlights of the Design Commission feedback from the February 12 meeting are as follows:

- Chestnut Avenue Building:
 - o The Design Commission was in favor of the design as submitted.
 - o There was one recommendation to consider a nicer roofing material above the main entrance, such as faux slate shingles.
- Campbell Street Building:
 - o There were concerns about the stone base terminating in the middle of the second floor windows, which created a castle-like crenellation appearance. It was encouraged to raise the stone to above the second floor windows.
 - o Similarly, there was concern about the castle-like crenellation appearance at the top of the brick piers at the eighth floor.
 - o The detailing of the curtain wall feature on the north elevation was discussed. It was recommended to add a horizontal break across the eighth or ninth floor line to give more hierarchy to the top of the building.
- Highland Avenue Building:
 - o There was concern about the understated appearance of the main building entrance on the north elevation. It was encouraged to enhance the entry design with additional detailing for a more grand appearance.
 - o Further design development of the first floor on the south elevation was encouraged to break up the appearance of the blank wall.
 - o One commissioner felt that the top glass portion of the building needed better integration with the masonry garage base.
 - o Two of the commissioners encouraged adding the curved central bay feature on the east elevation to match the west elevation.

Based on the feedback received at the February 12 Design Commission meeting, the petitioner has made the following changes to the proposed design:

- Chestnut Avenue Building:
 - o The asphalt shingles have been changed to a black faux slate roofing material.
- Campbell Street Building:
 - o The stone base has been raised to above the second floor windows, and transoms have been added to the second floor windows.
 - o The brick piers at the eighth floor have been lowered to align with the top of the brick wall.

- o A horizontal break has been added across the ninth floor line to give more hierarchy to the top of the building.
- o The exterior material at the top floors has been changed from PVC panels to EIFS.
- Highland Avenue Building:
 - o The design of the main building entrance on the north elevation has been enhanced with a grand appearance that works well with the design.
 - o Inset metal screens for vegetation have been added across the first floor on the south elevation, which work well to break up the appearance of the blank wall.
 - o The decorative Azek cornice at the top of the glass curtain walls has been changed to a simple aluminum parapet cap.
 - o A flat glass curtain wall has been added in the middle of the east elevation.

Staff comments on the revisions are as follows:

- Chestnut Avenue Building:
 - o Overall, the proposed design is very nicely done, and the faux slate roofing is a nice enhancement to the design.
 - o The petitioner needs to clarify the material and finish of the ramp walls going down to the garage. The renderings illustrate brick, and the architectural drawings show a large-format running bond. It was previously mentioned that this will be a concrete form liner. If so, the finish/color needs to be confirmed.
 - o Staff recommends approval of the design as submitted, with clarification of the ramp wall material and finish.
- Campbell Street Building:
 - o The changes to the stone and brick detailing are nicely done, and address the Design Commission's concerns.
 - o Staff recommends approval of the design as submitted.
- Highland Avenue Building:
 - o For a more cohesive appearance, it is recommended that the central curtain wall feature on the east elevation be revised with a curved bay to match the west elevation.
 - o The "44 S. Highland" wall sign is not allowed above the second floor ceiling. The sign should be revised to comply with code, or a sign variation would be required.
 - o Signage should be developed for the parking garage so as to promote available customer parking for the development.
 - o Staff recommends approval of the design, with these recommendations.

Additional Staff comments include all mechanical equipment, utility equipment, and utility meters are required to be screened from public view. All three buildings include perimeter parapet walls to screen the rooftop mechanical equipment. All wall-mounted equipment and meters must also be screened from view. The site plan indicates preliminary meter locations on the side and rear of the buildings. Staff recommends a condition of approval stating that where possible, all equipment and meters should be inside the buildings; however, for equipment that is required to be on the exterior, it shall be located on the side or rear elevations, away from the public walks, and enclosed with decorative metal screens. Separate sign permits and detailed sign plans will be required for the proposed address wall signs.

Chair Fitzgerald asked about any variations being requested for this project, and Mr. Hautzinger said that he did not have a prepared summary of variations; however, in general, the petitioner is seeking approval to rezone a portion of the site in the center of the block, PUD approval is required, and a land use variation to allow residential units on the first floor of the Chestnut building in the B-5 district.

Mr. Ross said that revised plans were submitted, and both Rob and Kelle from Tinaglia Architects could respond to any questions or comments from the commissioners. Mr. Losselyoung clarified that the material and finish of the ramp walls of the Chestnut building are intended to be form liner walls with brick piers around the opening. The ramp walls will be finished in a color to match the stone at the base of the building, with the form liner pattern as shown on the architectural drawing.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Susan Catlin said that she lives on Wing Street. She commented that the parking garage looks like a municipal parking garage; it does not look any different than the Municipal parking garage. She asked who the architect is for the Highland building, and Chair Fitzgerald replied that the same architect is designing all 3 buildings. Ms. Catlin felt the building looked too much municipal. She has lived in downtown Arlington for 14 years and said this looks really bad.

Kathleen Gabriel, 115 N. Pine Avenue. She stated that her comments are going to be more appropriate for March 27th. She has lived in Arlington Heights her entire life and has seen all the development, and is concerned that Arlington Heights is taking the term 'heights' very very literally. We are becoming a town of towers and aesthetically, she found the proposed project institutional looking, just like many other buildings in town. The concentration of this project makes her claustrophobic just thinking of the heavy, heavy concentration of all the buildings in a relatively small space. She is very familiar with this area and is concerned about the largeness of the project, and will attend the Plan Commission hearing on March 27th with more specific comments.

Keith Moens, 636 S. Cleveland Avenue. He is trying to ascertain what the number of affordable units will be in this project. The petitioner replied that the affordable housing component is currently being discussed with Staff and will be part of a Housing Commission hearing in the near future.

The commissioners gave their comments.

Commissioner Eckhardt had no issues with the Chestnut building and appreciated the roof change to simulated slate, which he felt was elegant and rich looking. He also appreciated and supported the form liner being used, along with brick and stone, which was a nice detail. He had no other issues with the Chestnut building. He appreciated that his previous comments about the Campbell building were addressed, and he asked for clarification of the material and color in the rendering of the bright white crown above the second-floor window, as well as the pilasters and the columns. Mr. Losselyoung said that what appears as white in the rendering will actually be more of a light grey limestone color, and the color of the pilasters and columns will be buff; the color difference would be much softer than as shown in the rendering. Commissioner Eckhardt was okay with the rear of the building, and had the same comment about the top of the building with the bright white pieces; he was disappointed that a sample was not presented tonight and felt the motion should include a review of a comparison of the buff and the trim color. In response to the resident comment that the parking garage looks like a municipal garage, Commissioner Eckhardt explained that the intent is to pick up the same architecture as the existing municipal garage, which he felt was appropriate because it would send a clear message that it is a parking garage. He liked the improvements that were made to the entrance of the Highland building, he supported a variation for signage above the second-floor ceiling height as shown, and he added a suggestion to enhance the sign with LED lighting. Commissioner Eckhardt also supported the details of the glass box on the corners, which is true to the aesthetic of the building, and he suggested the curved bay element on the west elevation also be on the east elevation, at least at the top 3 or 4 floors at a minimum. In conclusion, Commissioner Eckhardt was okay with the Highland building as proposed. He had no further comments and was ready to make a motion tonight.

Commissioner Kingsley thanked the petitioner for the hard work that went into the project and the changes that were made. With regards to the Campbell building, she was pleased to see that the piers were brought up. She pointed out where the buff color material and the limestone would be located on the building and asked if the light grey color of the limestone would be cool or warm in nature. Mr. Losselyoung said that either could be used. Commissioner Kingsley referred to the material sample board that had really warm materials, and had concerns that a grey limestone color

could be too stark. She felt the color should be reconsidered to ensure its compatibility with the other materials being proposed. In general, she really liked the color palette, which blends itself with the Arlington Heights aesthetic, but felt that care should be taken with the selection of the limestone to make sure it is more of a warm buff color, and lighter than the one being shown. Commissioner Kingsley was not in favor of using EIFS for the horizontal band through the curtain wall because the materials will wear differently and not look the same. She was also not in favor of using EIFS for the walls on the top 2 floors. With regards to the detailing of the second floor window heads, she suggested the petitioner look at how high the header will be and the tightness between the header and the stone band; maybe they should be separated. She also suggested getting rid of the white bases of the brick piers at the third floor line, which she felt were not appropriate.

With regards to the Highland building, Commissioner Kingsley appreciated the effort put into the entrance, and she liked the signage shown above the second-floor. Mr. Losselyoung reviewed the materials and colors proposed for the building, and Commissioner Kingsley asked if the buff color would be lighter or similar to the color on the Campbell building, and if the EIFS color would match the Campbell building. Mr. Losselyoung said that the buff stone color would be lighter, but the EIFS color would match the white color at the top of the Campbell building. Commissioner Kingsley said she was not in favor of the white color on either the Highland building or the Campbell building, and she was not in favor of the EIFS. She appreciated the cornice detail that was done at the top portion of the Highland building, but she was not in favor of the design in general; it was not cohesive. Commissioner Kingsley had no further comments.

Commissioner Kubow said that although he was not at the previous review of this project, he has reviewed both the meeting minutes and the plans that were presented and he appreciates all the time and consideration the petitioner put into responding to the commissioner's comments and concerns that are reflected in the design being presented tonight. He felt the buildings were better looking than before. Additionally, he felt the petitioner did a great job with overall site planning for the project in terms of density, transitioning, and the architecture. The designs nicely transitioned from west to east with a more traditional look, and more contemporary architecture towards the Highland building where there is more density. He appreciated the color palette as well, which he agreed is very much an ode to Arlington Heights, and felt the petitioner paid close attention to the Design Guidelines and the Village Comprehensive Plan.

In general, Commissioner Kubow wished the project was a little more contemporary in design. He asked about the window color and if the same color would be used on all 3 buildings. Mr. Losselyoung said that the windows on all 3 buildings would be bronze, and the tower on the Highland building would have a slight window tint for the floor to ceiling windows, with opaque spandrel panels. Commissioner Kubow referred to the Campbell building and he liked the modern curtain wall element as a transition from traditional to more modern, as well as the consistency in the material palette. He really liked both the Campbell and the Chestnut building, which address the issue of transition; however, he was struggling with the tower on the Highland building, although he understood what was trying to be accomplished. He asked if the Village was requiring the new parking garage to match the existing parking garage, and Mr. Hautzinger said no, this was the petitioner's choice. Commissioner Kubow liked the cornice detail, he was not against the white color, and felt the EIFS was a fine product to use; however, he was struggling with the lack of separation aesthetically from the Village garage. He also appreciated what was done with the entrance, making it more grand, and the height of the signage made no difference to him. In terms of the curved versus flat pieces, he was fine with flat on both sides for consistency, or he was also fine with curved on one side and flat on the other side. He had no other comments at this time.

Commissioner Seyer applauded the efforts of the petitioner to take the comments made by the commissioners and bring them into this latest design. He had no objections to the Chestnut building; it looked nice and the scale was appropriate. He liked the improvements that were made to the Campbell building, both in design and materials, with the exception of the white color of the cornice that was a little bit off and contrasting to the warm colors in the renderings. He recommended changing the white color to an off-white color instead. With respect to the Highland building, Commissioner Seyer acknowledged the changes that were made with respect to the integration of the glass and the parking, which he felt were better; however, he felt the white color at the top of the building should be a color more

complimentary to the rest of the palette. The spandrel glass seemed fairly transparent, and he cautioned the petitioner about the challenges of making a shadow box in the way it is shown in the rendering; more thought should be given to what that color is, especially in a mock-up to get the desired consistent appearance as shown in the rendering. With respect to the center bay, Commissioner Seyer questioned why the curve was there to begin with because it was foreign to the entire massing of the building. To him, the curve was odd; however, he liked the idea and supported the idea of matching it on both sides of the building. He added that although he was not objecting to the signage location aesthetically on the Highland building, he felt more thought should be given to how successful that sign location will be for the address, people driving up to the building will not be able to see the address because it is so high, especially with the canopy blocking the view of the sign.

Chair Fitzgerald liked the entire campus of 3 buildings and the way they match the existing buildings around the site. He liked how the Highland building is more modern and in the middle of everything, and will eventually be bordered on all four sides. He also liked that the Highland building matches the existing Village garage, making the garage less obvious. He was okay with the location of the building address on the Highland building, and he liked the details of the entrance; the height of it, the width of it, and felt it would solve the issues previously brought up by the commissioners. Chair Fitzgerald also liked the curved wall glass element on the Highland building; the building looked like it could have been an old building and then additions were done to it to bring it to be old versus modern, which he liked. He was okay with the flat element on the east side of the building; either way was fine with him, and he agreed with the concerns about the white color at the top of the building and wanted to see a warmer color. He also agreed with Staff's comments about hiding mechanical and utility equipment. Overall, Chair Fitzgerald liked the project and felt it was exciting, especially how each building was designed for a specific market of residents.

Commissioner Eckhardt felt that it should be a requirement that the top of the Highland building not be white.

Commissioner Kingsley wanted to clarify that comments about the garage on the Highland building matching the adjacent Village parking garage were brought up at previous meetings, where it was said that this was the petitioner's intent. She felt this was a huge challenge, to try to match the existing garage. She also agreed with Commissioner Seyer's comments that the curved element on the Highland building was unnecessary; she liked the building better without the curve.

Commissioner Kubow reiterated Chair Fitzgerald's comment that the Highland building would at some point be surrounded by something being built at the south end of this parcel; therefore, not much of the parking garage would be visible. He also agreed with Commissioner Kingsley's comment that it is difficult design challenge to attach to the existing garage, and how to approach that in terms of design. In general, Commissioner Kubow really liked this development and was excited to see something built here; the Village needs the density. He hoped the Village trustees make the right decision this time.

There were no further comments from the commissioners.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER KUBOW, TO APPROVE THE PROPOSED ARCHITECTURAL DESIGNS for 33 S. CHESTNUT AVENUE, 225 W. CAMPBELL STREET, AND 44 S. HIGHLAND AVENUE. THIS APPROVAL IS BASED ON AND SUBJECT TO COMPLIANCE WITH THE REVISED PLANS DATED AND RECEIVED 3/01/19, DESIGN COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS, COMPLIANCE WITH ALL APPLICABLE FEDERAL, STATE, AND VILLAGE CODES, REGULATIONS, AND POLICIES, THE ISSUANCE OF ALL REQUIRED PERMITS, AND THE FOLLOWING:

1. CHESTNUT BUILDING:

- A. A REQUIREMENT THAT THE RAMP WALL BE DETAILED WITH A COMBINATION OF RED BRICK PIERS ABOVE AND CONCRETE PANELS THAT ARE FORMED WITH FORM LINERS BELOW.
- B. A REQUIREMENT THAT THE SIMULATED SLATE ROOFING SAMPLE PRESENTED TONIGHT BE USED.

2. CAMPBELL BUILDING:

- A. A REQUIREMENT THAT THE BRIGHT WHITE COLOR BE ELIMINATED AND A SOFT OFF-WHITE OR BUFF COLOR COMPATIBLE TO THE OTHER WARM COLORS BE SELECTED.
 - B. THAT STAFF REVIEW THE COLOR OF THE STONE CROWN MOULDING TO MAKE A DETERMINATION OF THE COMPATIBILITY OF THE WARM TONES, AND IF NECESSARY, BROUGHT BACK TO THE DESIGN COMMISSION FOR REVIEW.
 - C. A REQUIREMENT TO ELIMINATE THE BRICK PIER BASES ON TOP OF THE STONE CROWN MOULDING.
3. HIGHLAND BUILDING:
- A. THE DESIGN BE APPROVED AS SUBMITTED WITH A BAY ON ONE SIDE OF THE BUILDING AND FLAT ON THE OTHER SIDE OF THE BUILDING.
 - B. A RECOMMENDATION THAT THE PETITIONER SUBMIT EXHIBITS FOR SIGNAGE THAT HIGHLIGHT THE PUBLIC PARKING ENTRANCE.
 - C. A REQUIREMENT THAT ALL METERS BE SCREENED AND/OR LOCATED NOT ON PUBLIC WALKWAYS WHERE THEY CAN BECOME A VISUAL NUISANCE OR TRIPPING HAZARD.
 - D. A RECOMMENDATION THAT THE ENTRANCE TO THE BUILDING BE HIGHLIGHTED WITH SPECIALITY LIGHTING TO MAKE ITSELF MORE PROMINENT.
 - E. THE HEIGHT OF THE SIGN AS SHOWN IS ACCEPTABLE, WITH A RECOMMENDATION TO ALSO CONSIDER SIGNAGE AT A PEDESTRIAN LEVEL.
 - F. A REQUIREMENT THAT THE BRIGHT WHITE COLOR BE ELIMINATED AND A SOFT OFF-WHITE OR BUFF COLOR COMPATIBLE TO THE OTHER WARM COLORS BE SELECTED.
4. THIS REVIEW DEALS WITH ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN ONLY AND SHOULD NOT BE CONSTRUED TO BE AN APPROVAL OF, OR TO HAVE ANY OTHER IMPACT ON, NOR REPRESENT ANY TACIT APPROVAL OR SUPPORT FOR THE PROPOSED LAND USE OR ANY OTHER ZONING AND/OR LAND USE ISSUES OR DECISIONS THAT STEM FROM ZONING, BUILDING, SIGNAGE OR ANY OTHER REVIEWS. IN ADDITION TO THE NORMAL TECHNICAL REVIEW, PERMIT DRAWINGS WILL BE REVIEWED FOR CONSISTENCY WITH THE DESIGN COMMISSION AND ANY OTHER COMMISSION OR BOARD APPROVAL CONDITIONS. IT IS THE PETITIONER'S RESPONSIBILITY TO INCORPORATE ALL REQUIREMENTS LISTED ON THE CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS INTO THE PERMIT DRAWINGS, AND TO ENSURE THAT BUILDING PERMIT PLANS AND SIGN PERMIT PLANS COMPLY WITH ALL ZONING CODE, BUILDING CODE AND SIGN CODE REQUIREMENTS.

Commissioner Kingsley asked if landscaping and lighting between the building should be discussed tonight, and Mr. Hautzinger replied that site design elements and landscaping will be reviewed by the Plan Commission. Commissioner Kingsley suggested the motion include a statement that the lighting should be pleasing, not harsh, and integrated with the design of all 3 buildings; less is more.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER KUBOW, TO AMEND THE MOTION TO ADD THE FOLLOWING:

- 5. AS A NOTE TO THE PLAN COMMISSION AND VILLAGE BOARD, THE LANDSCAPING INTEGRATION, SOFT LIGHTING, AND LIGHTING IN GENERAL NEEDS TO BE STUDIED CAREFULLY IN AND AROUND THE BUILDINGS FOR PEDESTRIAN USE.

With regards to the Highland building, Commissioner Eckhardt suggested adding to the motion an option for the petitioner to either add another curved bay window or eliminate both of them, since the commissioners have voiced differing opinions. Chair Fitzgerald was okay with that option. Commissioner Seyer said that he and Commissioner Kingsley were okay with them both being flat, if that was the direction the petitioner wanted to pursue. Commissioner Kubow agreed as well.

Mr. Hautzinger asked for clarification regarding the requirement about the ramp walls for the Chestnut building. Commissioner Eckhardt just wanted the record to show a requirement to treat the ramp walls with the brick and stone

form liners and coloration. Mr. Losselyoung clarified that there will be brick piers above as posts for the guard rails, and the ramp walls below will be a form liner wall.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, SECONDED BY COMMISISONER KUBOW, TO AMEND THE MOTION AS FOLLOWS:

3. HIGHLAND BUILDING:

- A. THE DESIGN BE APPROVED AS SUBMITTED WITH A BAY ON ONE SIDE OF THE BUILDING AND FLAT ON THE OTHER SIDE OF THE BUILDING, OR AS AN OPTION TO THE PETITIONER, EITHER ELIMINATE THE BAY WINDOW ON THE WEST ELEVATION, OR ADD A BAY ON THE EAST ELEVATION, OR MAKE THEM BOTH THE SAME FLAT.

Commissioner Kingsley asked for clarification that the vote is for all 3 buildings in one vote, and Chair Fitzgerald said that it is.

SEYER, AYE; KUBOW, AYE; ECKHARDT, AYE; FITZGERALD, AYE; KINGSLEY, NAY.
THE MOTION CARRIED.

APPROVED

MINUTES OF
THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS
DESIGN COMMISSION MEETING
HELD AT THE ARLINGTON HEIGHTS MUNICIPAL BUILDING
33 S. ARLINGTON HEIGHTS RD.
FEBRUARY 12, 2019

Chair Fitzgerald called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

Members Present: John Fitzgerald, Chair
Ted Eckhardt
Kirsten Kingsley

Members Absent: Scott Seyer
Jonathan Kubow

Also Present: Andy & Voula Behlis, Owner of 1518 W. Thomas St.
Mike Firsel, Firsel Ross for *Arlington Block 425*
Robert Losselyoung, Tinaglia Architects for *Arlington Block 425*
Kelle Bruckbauer, Tinaglia Architects for *Arlington Block 425*
Bruce Adreani, Norwood Builders for *Arlington Block 425*
Steve Hautzinger, Staff Liaison

REVIEW OF MEETING MINUTES FROM JANUARY 22, 2019

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER KINGSLEY, TO APPROVE THE MEETING MINUTES OF JANUARY 22, 2019. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED.

ITEM 2. CBD MIXED-USE REVIEW

DC#18-104 – Arlington Block 425 - Campbell/Chestnut/Highland

Chair Fitzgerald said that with only 3 of the 5 commissioners here tonight, a positive vote from all 3 commissioners was needed for the project to continue moving forward, unless the petitioner wanted to continue the review to the next meeting.

Michael Firsel, representing *Firsel Ross*, Robert Losselyoung and Kelle Bruckbauer, representing *Tinaglia Architects*, and Bruce Adreani, representing *Norwood Builders*, were present on behalf of the project.

Mr. Hautzinger presented Staff comments. The petitioner is here tonight seeking approval of the architectural designs for 3 new multi-story apartment buildings in the Downtown. This is the design review portion of the approval process, and comments regarding the architecture or aesthetics are welcomed. However, any issues regarding zoning, parking, height, setbacks will be discussed at the Plan Commission hearing that will take place in March. Because this project is going to the Plan Commission, the role of the Design Commission is limited to building and signage only. This project received a preliminary review by the Design Commission on December 11, 2018, and those drawings were used as reference tonight.

Mr. Hautzinger reviewed the comments made at the previous review on December 11, 2018, which included the following:

General Comments:

- o The Design Commission was in favor of the overall style and design direction for the three buildings, except one of the Commissioners felt that the designs of three buildings should be more cohesive, more innovative, and include more sustainable design features.

Chestnut Avenue Building:

- o The two gables on the front elevation were encouraged to be omitted.
- o Additional design development to highlight the front entry was encouraged.
- o The keystone detailing in that flat arches was discouraged.
- o Detailing of the ramp walls leading to the underground garage was encouraged.
- o One Commissioner did not like the cornice design or cornice materials.

Campbell Street Building:

- o Additional design development of the west façade was encouraged to add more interest to the design.
- o Increasing the height of the first floor stone base was encouraged.
- o Increasing the thickness of the thin cornice brackets was encouraged.
- o Clarification of the balcony support structure was requested.
- o Further study of the bump out on the north elevation was encouraged to resolve the imbalance of having windows on one side, but not the other.
- o One Commissioner did not like the cornice design or cornice materials, stating that foam brackets and PVC panels are not sustainable building materials.

Highland Avenue Building:

- o There was concern about the appearance of the glass curtain walls at the garage levels on the north and south elevations being dark at night and looking different from the apartment level curtain walls above. Further study and design development of this area was encouraged.
- o One Commissioner did not agree with matching the existing Village garage design at the garage levels, had concerns about the solar heat gain of the glass curtain wall at the apartment levels, and felt the cornice detail at the top of the building should be more modern.
- o One Commissioner was opposed to the large “44” sign at the top of the building.

Based on the feedback received at the preliminary Design Commission review, the petitioner made the following changes to the proposed design:

Chestnut Avenue Building:

- o The two gables on the front elevation have been omitted.
- o The design of the main entrance has been enhanced with a raised stone base.
- o The keystone detailing in that flat arches has been omitted.
- o A form liner pattern has been added to the ramp walls leading to the underground garage.

Campbell Street Building:

- o The east and west facades have been enhanced with a taller stone base and a raised cornice to accentuate the center bay feature.
- o The stone base has been increased to the middle of the second floor windows on all sides of the building, and the height of the drive-through entrance has been raised.
- o The thin cornice brackets have been widened.
- o Hanger rods have been added to the balconies.
- o The windows on the side of the north elevation bump out have been omitted.

Highland Avenue Building:

- o The glass curtain walls at the garage levels on the north and south elevations have been omitted.
- o The large "44" sign at the top of the building has been omitted.

Staff comments on the revisions were as follows:

General Comments:

- o Exterior Materials. Overall, the exterior materials are quality, durable stone & masonry materials, which are nicely coordinated and work well together, providing a cohesive feeling throughout the development.

Chestnut Avenue Building:

- o Overall, the proposed design is very nicely done. The proposed traditional style and detailing will work very well in this location.
- o The decorative cornice and bay windows add richness to the design.
- o The alternating brick colors and individual entry porticos at the ground floor units provide a nice residential scale and give the building a row home feel.
- o Staff recommends approval of the Chestnut Avenue building as submitted.

Campbell Street Building:

- o Overall, the proposed design is very nicely done, and it will fit in very well with the character of the adjacent Downtown buildings.
- o The character of the first floor retail is well defined from the upper façade, and includes wall space for future retail signage.
- o The only comment on the design is to clarify the color of the stone trim pieces, which are illustrated as white in the renderings, but are not labeled on the architectural elevations. The raised stone bay on the east & west ends has a thick white cap that appears oversized. It is recommended that this detail be revised to match the stone cap at the drive-through bay on the north elevation.
- o Staff recommends approval of the Campbell Street building, to include the comments stated above.

Highland Avenue Building:

- o The garage levels are nicely designed to match the existing adjacent Village garage.
- o The glass curtain wall facade of the upper tower is distinctly different from other buildings in the Downtown and should be evaluated by the Design Commission.
- o Further design development of the north and south elevations is encouraged to better integrate the upper glass residential floors with the garage levels and building entrance below, similar to the center portion of the west elevation, which is nicely balanced and carries the brick material up into the residential floors.
- o The main entrance to the building on the north wall is understated for a luxury rental building. It is recommended that the design of the main entrance be enhanced with a grand appearance, and better integrated with the upper residential floors.
- o The west elevation includes a nicely designed curved curtain wall bay window feature in the center of the wall. It is recommended that this feature also be included on the east elevation to enhance the appearance of the east wall.
- o The first-floor of the south wall is large and blank. It is recommended that openings be added to break up the large wall area. However, consideration should be given to vehicle headlights circulating inside the garage.
- o Staff recommends the Design Commission evaluate the concerns regarding this building.

Mr. Hautzinger also reiterated that all mechanical equipment, utility equipment and utility meters are required to be screened, and all 3 buildings include perimeter parapet walls to screen the rooftop equipment. All wall-mounted equipment and meters must also be screened from view. The site plan indicates preliminary meter locations on the side and rear of the buildings, and where possible, all equipment and meters should be inside the buildings. For equipment that is required to be on the exterior, it shall be located on the side or rear elevations, away from the public walks, and enclosed with decorative metal screens. With regards to signage, the only proposed signs are wall-mounted street addresses on each building mounted above the main entrance. Separate sign permits and detailed sign plans will be required, but the proposed signs are nicely designed and appear to be code compliant. The petitioner should clarify the proposed sign materials and if/how the signs will be illuminated.

Ms. Bruckbauer thanked the commissioners for the comments made at the preliminary review, which were considered and incorporated into the current design as much as possible. With regards to Commissioner Kingsley's previous comments about sustainability, they realize the importance of this and after discussing with ownership, they are attempt to obtain LEED certification for the project. A material change was made on the Highland and Campbell buildings with the PVC material on the upper floors changed to either EIFS or stucco, although the color will remain the same. This change is not shown on the plans being reviewed tonight.

Mr. Losselyoung addressed a few of the comments from Staff. The rendering of the Campbell building did not correctly show the cornice line on the middle portion of the west elevation as mentioned by Staff. This cornice will be detailed with a light grey stone band, similar to the cornice above the drive-through entrance on the front elevation. The lack of openings on the south elevation of the Highland building is because of the way the ramp will be coming up and through this side and back up along the exiting Village parking garage. However, they do understand the pedestrian feel should be increased there, so they would consider some sort of screens or faux storefront panels there. In terms of signage, the intention on all 3 buildings is that signage will be face lit from a gooseneck light fixture up above.

Commissioner Eckhardt asked for clarification on the slope of the ramps, and Mr. Losselyoung said that the ramp will come up on the first-floor, and on the first-floor only there will be a ramp that leads to a flat spot on the second floor, and then that entire side will ramp up inside the building, and then it will come around and on this side the entire second-floor will be flat, and then the ramp will come back around and then it will ramp up to the third floor. The transition for most floors is abutted up against the against Village garage. Mr. Losselyoung also said that Staff comments about the front elevation of the Highland building can be further evaluated to create a better entry element, such as enlarging the entry feature, possibly tie in a glass feature or a taller element.

Chair Fitzgerald asked if there was any public comment on the project and there was response from the audience.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Ray Anderson, 200 W. Campbell St. He lives across the street from the site and has been a real estate broker for 25 years. He has concerns about the lack of detail on the entrance to the Highland building, it looks like an entrance to a parking garage. Being the biggest of the 3 buildings, he felt the entrance should be dramatic. He also asked about how the light from the setting sun would be controlled from entering the apartments, such as window blinds. Mr. Losselyoung said that the glazing being provided will be very minimal and reflective.

A resident who did not give his name, asked when, where, and how the affordable housing component fits in to this project. Mr. Firsel replied that although not a part of the design review, an affordable housing proposal was made to the Village and is currently being considered by Staff. The Village has asked for additional information, which they have provided, and they anticipate a meeting with the Village in early March regarding this matter. This would be a separate meeting of the Village Housing Commission, which is also a public meeting. Mr. Firsel added that affordable housing is currently planned for the Highland building and the Campbell building, with at least 80% of the 300 units between the two buildings. There are 60 units in the Chestnut building, so as a proportion, there will be significantly less in the Chestnut building as currently planned.

There was no further public comment.

Commissioner Kingsley thanked the petitioner for considering the comments made at the preliminary review and making the changes that were done. She gave her comments on the Chestnut building. She felt the changes that were made looked really good and the building supported the aesthetic of the Village; it has materials that have been established in the Village, and she had no issues with it. She appreciated the things that were eliminated from the previous design and as a result, felt the Chestnut building looked a lot better. She asked if the cast stone trim around the windows would be one piece, and she encouraged the use of large pieces so it looked as much like limestone as possible. Mr. Losselyoung said that although he preferred it be one piece as well; he did not know if that was feasible.

Commissioner Kingsley gave her comments on the Campbell building. She liked the west elevation presented at the preliminary review better than the revised elevation being presented tonight. She would like it if the column capital details between the windows, which Mr. Losselyoung confirmed will be a light color stone such as limestone, were lowered to be in the same line. On the front elevation, she had the same comment to lower the stone cap to below the windows so it was continuous, and less like a crenellation. In regards to the center curtain wall feature, she liked that the original design had horizontal members to break it up. She suggested that the either the brick columns go all the way up, or add a horizontal member to connect the capitals at the eight floor line. Commissioner Kingsley also asked if the drive-through entry feature would be all stone, and Mr. Losselyoung replied that it will be stone except for the brackets and soffit which will be Fypon and Eifs to match the top of the building. He added that the bracket material had not yet been finalized. Commissioner Kingsley also suggested that the corner brick columns go all the way up, and then eliminate the brackets on the corner piers, or make the corner brackets different than the others, because the two corner brackets look crowded. In summary, she was glad to see some of the changes that were made to the Campbell building, but she liked the previous design better. She appreciated the change in material from PVC to EIFS at the top of the building.

Commissioner Kingsley gave her comments on the Highland building. She asked about the inspiration for the building and what the petitioner was trying to achieve. Mr. Losselyoung replied that they envision a different lifestyle with each building; the Chestnut building will be more detailed inside and out, possibly for older individuals; the Campbell building will be similar in scale and scope to a lot of the buildings along the Campbell corridor; and the Highland building will be something that tied into the design of the Village garage because it is along the property line, creating a unique structure within the center of this, with a parking garage below, and a loft-style building up above. Commissioner Kingsley liked that each of the buildings will have their own unique vision and target; however, she felt the Highland building design still needed work. She was having a hard time with the curtain wall and the masonry base. She said that the top of the building looks like an office building with a cornice, and it did not mesh with the

masonry garage base. She was unsure if they go together, or if they do, it is not successful quite yet. She felt it could be more successful if one of the two were eliminated, suggesting to either re-dress the parking garage to be more glass, or bring the masonry up into the two glass tower ends. She was also concerned about having living space behind a curtain wall. She felt that the main entrance looked like a parking garage entrance. In general, she liked the east elevation better than the west elevation, and she was not in love with the curved bay feature and how it terminated at the top. She had a similar comment about the brackets up at the top as she did with the other building, she felt the corner piers could go straight up. If the petitioner wants the aesthetic of brick, stone and glass, then she suggested bringing up brick piers at the corners of the glass tower might help to make sense of the cornice.

Commissioner Kingsley also questioned the height of the parking walls and if they would hide most of the headlights from cars, and Mr. Losselyoung replied that the walls are being brought up at least 42 inches above the parking deck height, which should hide most of the car headlights. Commissioner Kingsley was glad to hear this. She was also concerned about the aesthetic of the parking garage facing the back of the Chestnut building, and felt the space between them would be so much nicer if the design looked less like a parking garage than it does now. Commissioner Kingsley also asked for clarification on the location of the Azek material, and Mr. Losselyoung said it was located just at the top, but it has now been changed to EIFS. Commissioner Kingsley had no further comments.

Chair Fitzgerald asked for clarification on why the sides of the Campbell building were raised up, and Mr. Losselyoung explained that this change came mostly from Commissioner Eckhardt's comments at the preliminary review about wanting there to be some sort of stepping of the building on that side, as well as his uneasiness with the balance of that elevation; they tried to accommodate both of those comments in a way they felt married the front elevation as well as the rear elevation.

Commissioner Eckhardt gave his comments on the Chestnut building. He questioned the dark asphalt shingle roof being proposed on this very traditional building, versus a heavy/substantial slate or faux slate roof. He referenced the 2 levels of stone on the building that give a substantial feel and help break up the massing with the light and dark, which he felt was very successful and a great solution for Chestnut Avenue, which is an elevation that is very sensitive to the neighborhood.

Commissioner Eckhardt gave his comments on the Campbell building. He appreciated the changes, and he respected Commissioner Kingsley's comments about liking the other elevation, but some of things that she liked are some of the things he was concerned about at the preliminary review. He wondered why the stone caps did not extend up above the second floor windows to form a head piece that just goes straight across. He felt that it is very odd as drawn, and he could not think of another building of historic reference where a pilaster comes up halfway through a window with just a soldier course head being superior to it. He did not like this detail, and he wanted to see this change implemented, and felt it would really balance the elevation nicely. On the north elevation, he had the same comment; concern about the stone cap stopping halfway up, which needs to be raised up to above the second floor windows. If it were lowered down, it will look so light and under-structured to carry all that visual load. It should be raised up to create a nice strong stone base for the building. He was okay with the tall glass wall on the north elevation, especially since this is the major thoroughfare into the courtyard. On the south elevation, the raised stone base has to wrap all the way around. He felt strongly about the base being stronger at the bottom of the building.

Commissioner Eckhardt gave his comments on the Highland building. He agreed with Commissioner Kingsley about some of the issues of the building, and it was unfortunate that only 3 members were here tonight because this building is the most significant and challenging in terms of its size, and its complicated functionality with most of its parking being connected to the existing garage. He felt that eliminating most of the glass coming down on the building helped, but the front door area needed something more, possibly more glass, more detail similar to the main entrance on the Campbell building that says "this is the front door". In terms of the four elements on this building, he felt the glassy areas should either be endorsed or not, and he questioned if adding masonry piers at the corners would look too tall and thin. He felt the concept of a glassy building sitting on top of a parking garage was accomplished, and he continued to support this glassy end of the building. He recommended that the curved bay on the west elevation be repeated on the east elevation. He liked the rhythm of the of the west elevation.

Mr. Losselyoung said that they recently determined that access to the building for exterior window cleaning needed to be addressed; therefore, the walls of the amenity floor on the east and west elevation need to be set back approximately 5 to 6-feet to provide for a hidden walkway behind the brick facade that will allow window cleaners to ascend the building.

Commissioner Eckhardt continued with his comments on the Highland building. He was in agreement with the comment about fenestrating the lower portion of the south elevation. He summarized by saying that he still endorsed the look of the glass box, which maybe could be cut down a little bit, but he felt the apartment residents would enjoy the floor to ceiling glass. Commissioner Eckhardt had no further comments.

Chair Fitzgerald gave his comments on the Chestnut building. He really liked this building and he appreciated everything that was done to it. He also liked the comment made by Commissioner Eckhardt to reconsider a different roofing material. He really liked this building and could not say anything more about it.

Chair Fitzgerald gave his comments on the Campbell building. When he first saw this building at the preliminary review, he thought it was the existing building to the north; there were a lot of similarities and he appreciated the petitioner's explanation of how these 3 buildings all relate to the clients and the Village. He saw both sides of the comments made by the other commissioners, but he did like what was being presented tonight, but he was fine with either option. On the north elevation, he did like the comment about adding a horizontal detail near the top of the curtain wall, which he felt would really frame that out nicely; however, this would not be a requirement for him.

Chair Fitzgerald gave his comments on the Highland building. He loved most of the building; he loved the top and he liked the contrast of super modern against traditional, almost like it could have been an addition at some point or it could have been an upgrade. He also liked the curved bay detail on the west elevation, and felt it would help to add it to the east side as well. He was thinking forward about how this building will be in the middle of a lot of different things; eventually there will be something to the south, and there is the parking garage to the east; therefore, the parking garage on the bottom did not bother him that much. He agreed with the other comments made about the front entrance that it is underwhelming, and he was open to bringing back the curtain wall at the garage levels if it were solid across the back to prevent a different color of lighting from showing through. He commented that the front entrance is actually a lot wider than it appears in the rendering, but it does need some more glass and metal somewhere. He had concerns that it is all on one plane, except for the sign. If this could be adjusted, then he would be okay with it. Looking at all 3 buildings together, this building could be his favorite because it is surprising for Arlington Heights.

Chair Fitzgerald asked if there were any further comments from the commissioners, and if there was direction for moving forward with a motion tonight. Commissioner Eckhardt reiterated that with only 3 of the 5 members here tonight, a motion tonight would require a unanimous vote from all 3 members and he did not want to jeopardize all the work that was done by the petitioner. He felt very strongly about his comments on the Campbell building, which differ from the comments made by Commissioner Kingsley, but for the most part he endorsed the other comments made tonight. He added it sounds like all the commissioners feel that additional work is needed on the front entrance of the Highland building. He felt the 2 members not here tonight would be appreciative of the work that was done on the current design, and would focus on the same concerns that the commissioners expressed tonight, and he wanted those 2 members to have an opportunity to see the current design, and because this is a major development, he felt the project should go to the Plan Commission and Village Board with a strong recommendation from the Design Commission. It would be irresponsible of this commission to ask Staff to interpret their direction. He felt a vote should not be taken tonight unless it was for only 1 or 2 of the buildings, with the remaining buildings to be discussed and continued upon.

Commissioner Kingsley concurred with the comments made by Commissioner Eckhardt that a vote could be taken tonight on some of the buildings, but she was unsure if that would do much and felt it was advisable to take the comments and go forward after tonight, which also follows what Staff suggested in their report. Specifically with the Highland building, she felt it would be difficult to have it go just to Staff after tonight. She wanted to see the Highland

building and the Campbell building come back for another review. In response to Commissioner Eckhardt stating that her comments differed from his, she felt there were in fact some similarities to their comments. For clarification on the Campbell building, she liked Commissioner Eckhardt's suggestion to bring up the stone base; it was the crenellation that she did not like at the second floor or at the eighth floor. She was in support of raising the stone at the base higher up to make a stronger base on the building, and maybe do something similar at the eighth floor, bringing it up to the head of the windows or down to the sill.

Commissioner Eckhardt liked the comments that were made about the potential for a horizontal detail across the eighth floor of the north elevation curtain wall to create square windows at the top, which would separate the top of the building and make it more grand, and he suggested using the same brick material that is rising up. Commissioner Kingsley and Chair Fitzgerald agreed, but Chair Fitzgerald added that if the brick piers were extended all the way up, then he did not like adding a horizontal band, which Commissioners Eckhardt and Kingsley agreed with. Commissioner Eckhardt said that if the stone at the base was raised up to the head of the second floor windows as suggested by Commissioner Kingsley, then he was okay with the rest of the building. Commissioner Kingsley reiterated her suggestion that both the Campbell and the Highland buildings come back to the commission for another review so the petitioner can consider the comments and suggestions made tonight. Mr. Losselyoung agreed.

Mr. Adreani appreciated all the comments made tonight, as well as the comments made at the preliminary review, which they tried to incorporate into the design being shown tonight. They are open to all the comments being made and want this development to be pleasing to not only everyone here tonight, but residents as well, and they want to make sure this is a show stopper piece that will become a legacy for the Village. The thoughts and details being given tonight are things that they can change little by little as they go forward, and the most important thing they want to do is have unison amongst all the architects here tonight. If the project is continued to next month, someone here tonight might not be at that meeting; therefore, he looked to the commissioners for a positive outcome tonight, and they could then come back with the fine details to present when all the commissioners are present. He asked for a straw poll tonight to determine where the 3 commissioners are at.

Commissioner Eckhardt was comfortable making a motion that recommending approval of the Chestnut building with a requirement on the roofing material. He felt that feedback was given to the petitioner on the other 2 buildings that will allow them to discuss with their team the significant details and concerns brought up tonight, and continue to a date specific with the commission.

Mr. Firsel asked if the commissioners and Staff were comfortable approving part, but not all of the project tonight, and Mr. Hautzinger replied that this was an unusual situation, but he would advise against this because the project is being reviewed as one proposal. The Design Commission review is one part of the review process, and the Plan Commission still needs to review the project, and they will be looking at the whole project. He felt that design approval for just one building would not accomplish anything. Mr. Firsel said that because they are trying to be as diligent and responsive as possible, he asked if they could provide revised plans that take into consideration what was given tonight and return on February 26th. Chair Fitzgerald preferred to work with the petitioner's schedule rather than when all 5 members would be in attendance because of the possibility of changes in attendance. Commissioner Eckhardt said that he was not available for the next meeting on February 26th. Mr. Hautzinger added that when projects are continued, they are typically scheduled two meetings out, especially for a project this large, to allow time for the changes to be made and submitted to Staff for review. Continuation to a date specific would not require a new public notification.

Mr. Firsel said they are hoping to be on the Plan Commission agenda for March 13, which would be the day after the March 12 Design Commission review, and he asked if it was a requirement that the Design Commission review be complete with a vote before the Plan Commission review. Mr. Hautzinger replied that this in general, the Design Commission review should be completed prior to the Plan Commission review, but there is flexibility in the process. Mr. Firsel said their goal is to not go past March 12 with the Design Commission, and he was unsure if they could satisfy both Staff and their own team by the February 26th date. He also wanted to have as many commissioners present as possible so that all the commissioners could give their input and they could come up with the best solution. He was confident that they would satisfy the commissioners and Staff on the Campbell building; the ideas presented

tonight were phenomenal, and he agreed that the Highland building needs further study, but they could do so and submit as quickly as possible. He asked for an opportunity to try to make the February 26th meeting, and Mr. Hautzinger replied that revised drawings would be required by the end of this week for that meeting. Mr. Firsel asked for a 2 minute recess for his team to talk about the meeting dates.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER KINGSLEY, TO TAKE A SHORT RECESS TO ALLOW THE PETITIONER AND HIS TEAM TO DISCUSS FUTURE MEETING DATES.

ECKHARDT, AYE; KINGSLEY, AYE; FITZGERALD, AYE.
ALL IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED.

The meeting resumed after a 2 minute recess.

Mr. Firsel said that in light of what needs to be done, they want as many commissioners present as possible at the next review of the project, as well as enough time to work with Staff. He asked that the project be continued to March 12th.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER KINGSLEY, TO CONTINUE THE REVIEW OF THE ARLINGTON BLOCK 25 PROJECT (DC#18-104) TO THE MARCH 12, 2019 DESIGN COMMISSION MEETING.

ECKHARDT, AYE; KINGSLEY, AYE; FITZGERALD, AYE.
ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED.

Chair Fitzgerald asked about the timeframe of construction of the project, and Mr. Firsel said that the Campbell and Highland building would be built first.

APPROVED

MINUTES OF
THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS
DESIGN COMMISSION MEETING
HELD AT THE ARLINGTON HEIGHTS MUNICIPAL BUILDING
33 S. ARLINGTON HEIGHTS RD.
DECEMBER 11, 2018

Chair Fitzgerald called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

Members Present: John Fitzgerald, Chair
Ted Eckhardt
Kirsten Kingsley
Scott Seyer

Members Absent: Jonathan Kubow

Also Present: John Sorenson, U.S. Shelter Homes for 534 W. Ridge Ct.
Jim Sutphen, Abbell Associates for *Arlington Town Square*
Earl Mager, Shive Hattery for *Arlington Town Square*
Robert Losselyoung, Tinaglia Architects for *Arlington 425*
Kelle Bruckbauer, Tinaglia Architects for *Arlington 425*
Mike Firsell, Firsell Ross for *Arlington 425*
Steve Hautzinger, Staff Liaison

REVIEW OF MEETING MINUTES FROM NOVEMBER 27, 2018

A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER ECKHARDT, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER KINGSLEY, TO APPROVE THE MEETING MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 27, 2018. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED.

ITEM 3. CBD MIXED-USE PRELIMINARY REVIEW

Arlington 425 Development – Highland Ave/Chestnut Ave/Campbell Ave

Robert Losselyoung and Kelle Bruckbauer, representing *Tinaglia Architects*, and Mike Firsell, representing *Firsell Ross*, were present on behalf of the project.

Chair Fitzgerald pointed out the number of residents in the audience for this project.

Mr. Hautzinger said that this a preliminary design review tonight and no vote would be taken. The project will return for a formal Design Commission review and approval. Matters of zoning will not be discussed tonight, as they are part of the Plan Commission review of the project. This is design review only. Because this is a preliminary review, the petitioner will be presenting the project tonight. Preliminary Staff comments will be shared after the petitioner's presentation.

Mr. Firsell was present behalf of the petitioner for the project being called Arlington 425. Three buildings are being proposed, with 3 different architectural designs that were intentionally done. He introduced the architects for the project, Rob Losselyoung and Kelle Bruckbauer, who would give the presentation tonight on the 3 separate buildings. He reiterated that tonight's review is to review the architecture of the 3 buildings, and that all matters related to planning would be reviewed, discussed and assessed at the Plan Commission and Village Board.

Ms. Bruckbauer gave a brief overview of the site plan and layout of the 3 buildings. A campus of buildings was created, each of them unique in their architectural character and lifestyle that they will provide for residents; however, the buildings will share a common element to create a cohesive development. The project began with the 44 S. Highland building that will be 13-stories tall, with the first 6-stories to be a parking garage directly adjacent to the existing parking garage along the east side of the site. There will be 6-stories of residential units above that and 1-story of amenities on top of that. The second building is 225 W. Campbell that will be 9-stories tall and feel familiar to the other multi-story residential buildings in the Downtown area. One unique feature of this building is the vehicular entry access that goes through the first-story of the building and brings residents and guests to the internal circulation and the Highland parking garage. The third building is 33 S. Chestnut which is the shortest of the 3 buildings due to the proximity of the single-family residences. This building will be 4-stories tall with a residential feel and more pedestrian friendly in scale. All 3 buildings will have rooftop amenities for the residents that will include gathering spaces, fire pits and barbecue grills, the Campbell and Chestnut buildings will have small planted green roof areas, and the Highland building will have an entire green roof over the top level of the parking garage.

Mr. Losselyoung presented the architectural details of the 3 buildings. He presented updated renderings and clarified that the only difference is the color that was adjusted on the Highland building of the curtain wall, so it is more in line with the sample boards being presented tonight. He began with the 4-story Chestnut building that was created to have a very pedestrian friendly facade, appearing as a series of brownstone homes with lower first-floor entries to help break up the facade while keeping a uniform cornice line across, providing some raised elements such as the gables, and creating an architectural element in the center of the building that houses the elevators that go up to the roof deck. Stairwells going up to the roof will be located at the rear, with trellises on either side of the brick end walls to help add character and shade to the rooftop area. Fenced in yard areas will be located along the street, with walk ups to the front porches, and green roof areas. This building will have a standard brick size to create a residential scale, with rich dark

brown and a dark red alternating colors, bronze colored windows and balconies, a taupe color for the cornice line, and a stone base that will stagger in height.

The next building is the Campbell building that is more traditional in architecture. This will be a 9-story building, with first-story retail, second-story retail and office, and 7-stories of residential units above that. This building will use the same stone color at the base as the Chestnut building, but a different brick color and vertical pier elements to help break up the facade and give it more character. The main center entry of the building with the drive through to the courtyard will have a curtain wall assembly similar to the Highland building, and break up the long facade of the Campbell street elevation. This building will have bronze colored balconies as well, pvc, azek, and fypon trim work at the upper floors, and large 8' tall, 8" square brackets. It will also have approximately 16' of a stone base, 6-stories of brick, and 2-stories of trim details up above.

The last building is the Highland building, where it was important to continue the line of the existing Village parking garage with this new building. The base of the building will mimic and match the details of the existing adjacent parking garage, and have the same brick and concrete details. The parking garage will be 6-stories tall, with 6-stories of residential units above that, and 1-story of amenities at the top that will have tremendous views for residents of the building. The same brick that is on the Campbell building will be introduced on the Highland building, and climb up into the residential floors on either side, with the key feature of the building to be the curtain wall ends. This glass element will come down on the north side of the building to signify the entry point into the Highland building, because the existing Village parking garage is on Highland. On the other side of the building, there will be a waterfall effect of the glass coming down to create horizontal lines across the building. This building as well as the Campbell building, will have utility size brick, and most likely be a pre-cast building similar to the existing Village garage. Lastly, the amenity floor on the top of the Highland building will provide terraces and trellis for the residents to enjoy.

Mr. Hautzinger presented Staff comments based on the drawings received on November 30, 2018.

- General Comments:
 - o Exterior Materials. Very nice quality durable materials (stone & masonry). Overall, nicely coordinated materials work well together, and tie the development together.
- Chestnut Avenue Building:
 - o Overall, the proposed design looks great. Beautiful traditional style and detailing will work very well in this location.
 - o The decorative cornice and bay windows add richness to the design.
 - o Alternating brick colors and individual entry porticos at the ground floor units provide a nice residential scale and give the building a row home feel.
 - The two brick colors may not have enough contrast. Consider a new brick selection with slightly more contrast to accentuate the alternating brick appearance.
 - The two inner porticos are less impactful because of the single masonry pier and the lack of a railing above. Consider changing the detailing of the two inner porticos to match the design and detailing of the two outermost porticos.
 - o The two gables at the top of the building add interest to the roofline and help balance the center mansard roof. However, the gables are too shallow and have a fake appearance.
 - It is recommend that the gable depth be extended further back, at least 12 feet, for a more substantial appearance.

- Campbell Street Building:

- o Overall, the proposed design is very nicely done, and it will fit in very well with the character of the adjacent Downtown buildings.
- o The character of the first floor retail is well defined from the upper façade, and includes wall space for future retail signage.
- o For the final review, it is recommended that the rendering be adjusted to more accurately depict the proposed bronze tinted glazing, instead of the bright blue color as currently shown.

- Highland Avenue Building:

- o The garage levels are nicely designed to match the existing adjacent Village garage.
- o The upper glass curtain wall façade is distinctly different from other buildings in the Downtown and should be evaluated by the Design Commission.
 - Consider integrating vertical masonry piers to break down the large expanses of glass into sections, similar to the curtain wall detailing on the north elevation of the proposed Campbell building.
 - Confirm that the curtain wall glazing will not be highly reflective.
- o The architectural elevations and renderings should be updated to show the ground floor retail storefront on the north elevation.
- o The garage level floor plans should be updated to show the openings and jogs in the exterior walls.

Staff comments about mechanical equipment include:

All mechanical equipment, utility equipment, and utility meters are required to be screened from public view. All three buildings include perimeter parapet walls to screen the rooftop mechanical equipment. Additional details are required to confirm the locations and screening for all building-mounted utility equipment and meters. A preliminary utility plan needs to be provided to coordinate the locations and screening of all equipment, including exterior ground-mounted equipment.

Preliminary Signage Comments include:

The only signage proposed at this time are two street address signs on the Highland Building:

- North Elevation: A “44 S. Highland” wall sign is proposed above the main entrance. Additional signage details will be required, but the proposed sign appears to be nicely designed and code compliant.
- West Elevation: A large number “44” wall sign is proposed at the top of the building. Wall signs are not allowed above the second floor in the Downtown, so the proposed sign should either be omitted or a sign variation requested. The Design Commission should provide preliminary feedback on the proposed sign.

Mr. Hautzinger concluded Staff comments.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Joe Glansy, 1 S. Highland Avenue. He asked if the buildings would be condominiums or apartments and Mr. Firsel said that all the buildings would be apartment units, although it was possible that the Chestnut building could be condominiums down the road.

Keith Moens, 636 S. Cleveland Avenue. He asked where and when the affordable housing component of this project would be discussed. Mr. Hautzinger replied that this component would be discussed as part of the Plan Commission review, with a separate public notification when that meeting is scheduled.

Donald Meersman, 202 S. Highland Avenue. He thanked the commissioners for their time and expertise with this gigantic project. His question was whether the mandate of the Design Commission, based on comments made by Staff at the review of the project previously proposed at the south end of this block, was ever clarified, because he never understood the explanation given by Staff at that time, which is that the Design Commission is charged with looking at the design of a building, independent of its neighbors. He said this Commission's work is very important and he wanted to know if the Design Commission's role was clarified to make recommendations as to how these designs coordinate with their neighbors.

Mr. Hautzinger stated that the Municipal Code and the mandate of the Design Commission has not changed; the code has always stated that for projects such as this that are also reviewed by the Plan Commission, the Design Commission reviews building and signage only. In response to the resident comment regarding context, the Design Commission is not being asked to ignore context, but to consider context from an architectural point of view. For example, the rowhome approach and residential style when located across from the single-family neighborhood, is a great example of responding to that context, in terms of design. The Campbell building as it relates to the buildings across the street and adjacent in the Downtown, is a great approach to using context for design. However, when it comes to the scale of these buildings or the setback of these buildings, those discussions will take place at the Plan Commission review.

Chair Fitzgerald asked what if any variations are being requested for this project. Mr. Firsel reviewed the 3 variations currently being requested, which do not include height, density or parking.

Commissioner Seyer felt the overall project had great materials that work really well within the context. With regards to the Chestnut building, he said it was difficult to determine whether or not the joints in the glass portions would have any texture, or were just flush with the façade. He felt that having texture would be better and make it feel richer. With regards to the Campbell building, Commissioner Seyer said that the curtain wall bump out helps break up the facade on the north elevation that has the larger glass openings; however, it appears to be solid on one side and glass on the other side, and he felt they should be the same on both sides, preferably solid. He encouraged further study of this. He questioned the construction of the actual balconies, which would probably require some sort of diagonals for support that are not currently shown, and he was concerned that diagonal supports would cheapen the look of the balconies. He preferred the balconies be as clean as currently being shown, and cantilevered without hanger rods. With regards to the Highland building, he had issues with the design of the glass curtain wall being brought down to the parking levels. This is all about a building that is sitting on top of a parking structure, and although a good job was done mimicking the architecture of the rest of it, he felt the glass facades at the parking levels would never look the same as what was being shown tonight. The glass and the idea of bringing the tower down is just not working for him, and he suggested looking at alternate facade ideas for this area. Commissioner Seyer also acknowledged that the rooftop terraces were set back from the street to help maintain some privacy for the residents, and although the mechanical equipment is schematic at this time, he reinforced that any mechanical equipment should be shielded and screened.

Commissioner Eckhardt asked about the future use of Parcel 2 located across the street, which is also owned by the petitioner. Mr. Firsel replied that Parcel 2 was originally included in this PUD; however, it has been removed for several reasons, one being that they want to concentrate on this project and this project alone, and second being about the possible use of this site for construction staging and parking, with the Highland and Campbell buildings being built first, and the Chestnut building currently planned to be built last. They also understand that there could be Village discussions regarding a possible change in the

Comprehensive Plan on the west side of Chestnut; therefore, ownership is just not ready to commit to what they want to do with Parcel 2 at this time.

Commissioner Eckhardt asked about the code required setbacks for all 4 sides of the site, and Mr. Losselyoung responded with this information. Commissioner Eckhardt asked if Lots 1-11 and 16-23 would be joined into one lot and Mr. Firsell said that they would be. Commissioner Eckhardt also asked if this project is being presented as a PUD, or set up as separate parcels. Mr. Firsell replied that this project will be a one lot Planned Unit Development.

Starting with the Chestnut building, Commissioner Eckhardt said he was okay with the 2-story stone and the 2-story brick elevations that are nicely fenestrated, but felt the articulation of the roof and the appropriateness of the 2 small gables were unconvincing and added more height to the building. He felt the front door was understated and questioned whether it should have more prominence, and he questioned the material of the ramp walls on the south elevation. Mr. Losselyoung said that brick veneer is currently proposed for the ramp walls, and Commissioner Eckhardt suggested using a concrete form liner that is less expensive, but still gave the texture of brick veneer. Commissioner Eckhardt also pointed out that the roof scape of this building would be very visible from the other 2 buildings, and he felt it looked a little scattered as currently shown. He complimented the petitioner on the aerial photograph presented.

With regards to the Campbell building, Commissioner Eckhardt felt the west elevation was unremarkable; it is very plain and one-story higher than all the buildings on the north, and it is the biggest building on Campbell. The weight of the dark center brick on top of a single story of light stone looks overwhelming, and he suggested 2-stories of stone at the base instead of one, for more visual support strength at the base. He felt the elevations were generally well balanced, and he complimented the petitioner on the spacing of the three buildings and the separation as the buildings go down in height, which is appropriate as proposed. Commissioner Eckhardt also commented that although he supported the idea of a regal element on the top of the building, the angle brackets being proposed appear too skimpy.

With regards to the Highland building, Commissioner Eckhardt had concerns about the glass curtain wall at the lower level on both the north and south elevations. Although he was not opposed to a segmented curtain wall, he felt the north curtain wall at the lower level needed more solid detailing at the building entry, and the large expanse of the glass curtain wall was unresolved and needed more study at levels 1 through 6. He questioned why the masonry at the upper levels appeared to thin from east to west, and Mr. Losselyoung explained that it had to do with the offset between the standard half garage levels. Commissioner Eckhardt asked about the heavy line of horizontal fascia shown at the floor levels between the curtain wall on all elevations, and Mr. Losselyoung replied that the line is currently shown as cut aluminum, but they are working on doing either spandrel glass or a clad horizontal. Commissioner Eckhardt had no further comments at this time.

Beginning with the Chestnut building, Commissioner Kingsley agreed with the comments made by the other commissioners, and felt that the layout of the three buildings was fairly nice. She had some hesitation with the center bay and how the roof comes through; however, in general, she felt it was fairly good, and the use of stone window surrounds and aluminum spandrel panels could be really nice. She had some hesitation with the cornice in general for all the buildings; she felt it was unnecessary, and the material selection of the cornices are inferior to the rest of the building; she did not agree with them. She did not care for the gable pediments at all, and felt that simplifying this building would make it a lot nicer. She also felt the keystone detail should be eliminated because it was not appropriate on the historical style of the building.

With respect to the site plan for the Campbell building, Commissioner Kingsley asked about the plantings shown under the building entry drive-thru, and Mr. Losselyoung replied that specific species that will grow in this area are still be worked out with their landscape architect. Commissioner Kingsley also asked why the east portion of the building is stepped back farther than the west portion of the building, and Mr. Losselyoung said it was because of the location of the adjacent buildings. In general, Commissioner Kingsley said she did not agree with that step back and did not care for this kind of drive-thru, which she felt was part of the architecture and not very pedestrian friendly. She understood and commended the petitioner for working things out with the cars, but felt it resulted in difficulties on the crosswalks, especially with the covered entry; therefore, she had some hesitation with that. With respect to the building, Commissioner Kingsley agreed with the comments made by the other commissioners; the columns are unresolved, and the top two floors should step in; there needs to be a reason for that versus just a material change, and there should be a reason for the materials being proposed on this historical style of building.

Commissioner Kingsley said that in general, the Village of Arlington Heights states on their website and most of their brochures, that the Village is sustainable and innovative. While she commends the Village on these efforts, she does not agree with the vision of the style direction of this complex of buildings because it does not say that the Village is innovative or sustainable. She liked that some of the proposed materials are noble, but felt that many of the materials are not necessarily sustainable, with a lot of them made from PVC or foam (fypon) materials, and she preferred to see materials that were true to themselves. She did not like the cornices, she did not like the brackets, and she did not like that the columns were not traditionally detailed. Commissioner Kingsley wanted to see a lot more sustainability and green items with the project; she wanted to see it be more inclusive and to focus on pedestrian versus cars. Although these items are not to be discussed by this commission, she pointed out that the scale and the architecture in most of this project did not focus on pedestrians.

With respect to the Highland building, Commissioner Kingsley agreed with the other commissioners that the glass garage walls would look very different than what was being shown tonight, and she did not care for the waterfall effect being proposed. However, more importantly, she did not agree with the design of the parking garage to match the old existing parking garage; it was okay that this new building attached to the existing parking and had similar qualities, but the petitioner should raise the bar and make the new building look nicer. She preferred some kind of screen over the openings at the garage levels, so they are not completely open, which has been done very successfully in other places. While Commissioner Kingsley agreed with a glass curtain wall, she felt it was unresolved at the top, and heat gain/loss should also be studied. She also reiterated that a glass curtain wall did not need to be topped with trellises, cornices, and brackets; she would rather see this be a modern expression than go back to all the traditional detailing up there.

Commissioner Kingsley acknowledged that this is a large project and a lot of thought was put into it, but there needed to be a clearer vision for all three buildings together. The buildings do not need to look alike, but the continuity between them is missing and they should be more cohesive.

With regards to the 33 S. Chestnut building, Chair Fitzgerald agreed that the gables on top of the building do not add a lot of value and look somewhat added on, and there should be more emphasis on the main entrance. He was okay with the brick variation on the building. With regards to the 225 W. Campbell building, he agreed that the west elevation needed more interest, although he was okay with the symmetry of it, and he liked the north elevation, although it would be difficult for any plants to grow in the entry areas under the building. He suggested paving those areas and adding urns with plantings that could be easily replaced.

With regards to the 44 S. Highland building, he was okay with matching the existing garage, but he was also open to seeing what else could be done there to make the garage of the new building look better. He liked the idea of adding some type of screen in the openings so it did not look so much like a garage from all angles, including views from the 33 S. Chestnut building. He agreed with the glass coming down in a waterfall effect over the garage on both the north and south ends of the building, and in general, felt that the entrance design needs to be beefed up. He was opposed to the "44" sign at the top of the Highland building and any variation for it.

In general, Chair Fitzgerald said it was a very nice project, he appreciated seeing it in a preliminary review, and felt that in general, it was headed in the right direction. He had no further comments at this time.

Chair Fitzgerald asked if there were any additional comments from the commissioners at this time. Commissioner Eckhardt said that he understands the reasons why the garage alignment has been extended on the south, and although not under the purview of this commission, he felt the 12-foot setback being proposed does have something to do with the character of the neighborhood, and does create a hardship for the future neighbor to the south. This is something that concerns him; not seeing a proposal for the entire site at the same time.

Commissioner Eckhardt concluded that he supports the project, he supports the massing, and he supports the 3 different buildings, although there are some small unresolved details on the elevations. He appreciated all the efforts by the petitioner to put together a logical presentation and involve the community on this project.

Mr. Firsel explained that the previous building to the south, that he also represented, which was reviewed and rejected by the Village, was within 5' of their lot line, and the Highland building being presented tonight is 2-1/2 times that. In response to a previous question about why the east end of the Campbell building was setback, he explained that the setback is intended to create more space for outdoor restaurant dining in that location, which will be the prime retail space in the building.

Chair Fitzgerald closed the preliminary review portion of the meeting.

Mr. Firsel asked the commissioners to consider a January review date for a formal review of the project, as they move forward with Plan Commission and Village Board review, and anticipated construction to begin next year. Mr. Hautzinger replied that January 22, 2019 would be the first possible option to return for a formal review, and he noted that the public notice signs will need to be updated, which Mr. Firsel agreed.

STAFF DESIGN COMMISSION REPORT RE-REVIEW

PROJECT INFORMATION:

Project Name: Arlington Block 425
Project Address: 225 W. Campbell Street
44 S. Highland Avenue
33 S. Chestnut Avenue

Prepared By: Steve Hautzinger
Date Prepared: January 29, 2019
Date Revised: March 5, 2019

PETITIONER INFORMATION:

DC Number: 18-104
Petitioner Name: Michael Firsell
Petitioner Address: Firsell Ross
2801 Lakeside Drive
Bannockburn, IL 60015

Meeting Date: February 12, 2019
Re-Review Meeting Date: March 12, 2019

Requested Action(s):

Approval of the proposed architectural designs for three new multi-story apartment buildings in the Downtown.

Design Commission Responsibility for Projects Being Reviewed by Plan Commission:

The subject design is being forwarded to the Design Commission for review pursuant to Chapter 6 of the Municipal Code.

This project requires Plan Commission review and Village Board approval for Rezoning, PUD, Land Use Variation, and other variations. Because this project is going to the Plan Commission, the role of the Design Commission is limited. The Design Commission's responsibility is as outlined in Chapter 28 of the Municipal Code, Section 14.2-1, which states:

*"For developments where a public hearing is necessary before the Plan Commission or Zoning Board of Appeals, the design review process should, if feasible, be completed by the time of the public hearing. Development proposals requiring rezoning, PUD or other Plan Commission approvals, shall be reviewed by the Design Commission **for building and signage only.**"*

Summary:

The petitioner is proposing three new buildings on the northern three-fourths of the existing vacant Block 425 in the Downtown:

- Chestnut Avenue Building:
 - 4 stories
 - 54 apartments
 - Underground parking
 - Rooftop terrace
- Campbell Street Building:
 - 9 stories
 - First floor retail space
 - Second floor commercial/retail/office space
 - 182 apartments, floors 3 through 9
 - Rooftop terrace
- Highland Avenue Building:
 - 13 stories
 - First floor retail space and parking garage
 - Parking garage, floors 2 through 6
 - 125 apartments, floors 7 through 12
 - 13th floor amenity space with rooftop terraces

Previous Design Commission Reviews:

This project received a preliminary Design Commission review on December 11, 2018 and a formal Design Commission review on February 12, 2019, at which time the project was CONTINUED to allow design concerns to be further studied and addressed. Highlights of the Design Commission feedback from the February 12 meeting are as follows:

- **Chestnut Avenue Building:**
 - The Design Commission was in favor of the design as submitted.
 - There was one recommendation to consider a nicer roofing material above the main entrance, such as faux slate shingles.
- **Campbell Street Building:**
 - There were concerns about the stone base terminating in the middle of the second floor windows, which created a castle-like crenellation appearance. It was encouraged to raise the stone to above the second floor windows.
 - Similarly, there was concern about the castle-like crenellation appearance at the top of the brick piers at the eighth floor.
 - The detailing of the curtain wall feature on the north elevation was discussed. It was recommended to add a horizontal break across the eighth or ninth floor line to give more hierarchy to the top of the building.
- **Highland Avenue Building:**
 - There was concern about the understated appearance of the main building entrance on the north elevation. It was encouraged to enhance the entry design with additional detailing for a more grand appearance.
 - Further design development of the first floor on the south elevation was encouraged to break up the appearance of the blank wall.
 - One Commissioner felt that the top glass portion of the building needed better integration with the masonry garage base.
 - Two of the Commissioners encouraged adding the curved central bay feature on the east elevation to match the west elevation.

Project Update:

Based on the feedback received at the February 12 Design Commission meeting, the petitioner has made the following changes to the proposed design:

- **Chestnut Avenue Building:**
 - The asphalt shingles have been changed to a black faux slate roofing material.
- **Campbell Street Building:**
 - The stone base has been raised to above the second floor windows, and transoms have been added to the second floor windows.
 - The brick piers at the eighth floor have been lowered to align with the top of the brick wall.
 - A horizontal break has been added across the ninth floor line to give more hierarchy to the top of the building.
 - The exterior material at the top floors has been changed from PVC panels to EIFS.
- **Highland Avenue Building:**
 - The design of the main building entrance on the north elevation has been enhanced with a grand appearance that works well with the design.
 - Inset metal screens for vegetation have been added across the first floor on the south elevation, which work well to break up the appearance of the blank wall.
 - The decorative Azek cornice at the top of the glass curtain walls has been changed to a simple aluminum parapet cap.
 - A flat glass curtain wall has been added in the middle of the east elevation.

Staff Comments:

- **Chestnut Avenue Building:**
 - Overall, the proposed design is very nicely done, and the faux slate roofing is a nice enhancement to the design.
 - The petitioner needs to clarify the material and finish of the ramp walls going down to the garage. The renderings illustrate brick, and the architectural drawings show a large-format running bond. It was previously mentioned that this will be a concrete form liner. If so, the finish/color needs to be confirmed.
- **Campbell Street Building:**
 - The changes to the stone and brick detailing are nicely done, and address the Design Commission's concerns.
- **Highland Avenue Building:**
 - For a more cohesive appearance, it is recommended that the central curtain wall feature on the east elevation be revised with a curved bay to match the west elevation.
 - The "44 S. Highland" wall sign is not allowed above the second floor ceiling. The sign should be revised to comply with code, or a sign variation would be required.
 - Signage should be developed for the parking garage so as to promote available customer parking for the development.

Mechanical Equipment, Utility Equipment, and Utility Meter Screening:

All mechanical equipment, utility equipment, and utility meters are required to be screened from public view. All three buildings include perimeter parapet walls to screen the rooftop mechanical equipment.

All wall-mounted equipment and meters must also be screened from view. The site plan indicates preliminary meter locations on the side and rear of the buildings. Where possible, all equipment and meters should be inside the buildings. For equipment that is required to be on the exterior, it shall be located on the side or rear elevations, away from the public walks, and enclosed with decorative metal screens.

Signage:

Separate sign permits and detailed sign plans will be required for the proposed address wall signs.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the Design Commission **approve** the proposed architectural designs for 33 S. Chestnut Avenue, 225 W. Campbell Street, and 44 S. Highland Avenue. This recommendation is based on, and subject to compliance with, the revised plans dated and received 3/1/19, Design Commission recommendations, compliance with all applicable Federal, State, and Village codes regulations and policies, the issuance of all required permits, and the following:

1. Chestnut building. Clarify the material and finish of the ramp walls going down to the garage.
2. Highland Avenue building. For a more cohesive appearance, it is recommended that the central curtain wall feature on the east elevation be revised with a curved bay to match the west elevation.
3. Highland Avenue building. The "44 S. Highland" wall sign is not allowed above the second floor ceiling. The sign should be revised to comply with code, or a sign variation would be required.
4. Highland building. Signage should be developed for the parking garage so as to promote available customer parking for the development.
5. Where possible, all mechanical and utility equipment and meters should be inside the buildings. For equipment that is required to be on the exterior, it shall be located on the side or rear elevations, away from the public walks, and enclosed with decorative metal screens.
6. This review deals with architectural design only and should not be construed to be an approval of, or to have any other impact on, any other zoning and/or land use issues or decisions that stem from zoning, sign code or building or any other reviews. In addition to the normal technical review, permit drawings will be reviewed for consistency with the Design Commission and any other Commission or Board approval conditions. It is the architect/owner/builder's responsibility to

comply with the Design Commission approval and ensure that building permit plans and sign permit plans comply with all zoning code, building code and sign code requirements.

March 5, 2019

Steve Hautzinger AIA, Design Planner
Department of Planning & Community Development

Cc: Charles Witherington Perkins, Director of Planning and Community Development, Bill Enright, Deputy Director of Planning and Community Development, Sam Hubbard, Development Planner, Petitioner, DC File 18-104

STAFF DESIGN COMMISSION REPORT

PROJECT INFORMATION:

Project Name: Arlington Block 425
Project Address: 225 W. Campbell Street
44 S. Highland Avenue
33 S. Chestnut Avenue

Prepared By: Steve Hautzinger
Date Prepared: January 29, 2019

PETITIONER INFORMATION:

DC Number: 18-104
Petitioner Name: Michael Firsell
Petitioner Address: Firsell Ross
2801 Lakeside Drive
Bannockburn, IL 60015

Meeting Date: February 12, 2019

Requested Action(s):

Approval of the proposed architectural designs for three new multi-story apartment buildings in the Downtown.

Design Commission Responsibility for Projects Being Reviewed by Plan Commission:

The subject design is being forwarded to the Design Commission for review pursuant to Chapter 6 of the Municipal Code.

This project requires Plan Commission review and Village Board approval for Rezoning, PUD, Land Use Variation, and other variations. Because this project is going to the Plan Commission, the role of the Design Commission is limited. The Design Commission's responsibility is as outlined in Chapter 28 of the Municipal Code, Section 14.2-1, which states:

*"For developments where a public hearing is necessary before the Plan Commission or Zoning Board of Appeals, the design review process should, if feasible, be completed by the time of the public hearing. Development proposals requiring rezoning, PUD or other Plan Commission approvals, shall be reviewed by the Design Commission **for building and signage only.**"*

Summary:

The petitioner is proposing three new buildings on the northern three-fourths of the existing vacant Block 425 in the Downtown:

- Chestnut Avenue Building:
 - 4 stories
 - 54 apartments
 - Underground parking
 - Rooftop terrace
- Campbell Street Building:
 - 9 stories
 - First floor retail space
 - Second floor commercial/retail/office space
 - 182 apartments, floors 3 through 9
 - Rooftop terrace
- Highland Avenue Building:
 - 13 stories
 - First floor retail space and parking garage
 - Parking garage, floors 2 through 6
 - 125 apartments, floors 7 through 12
 - 13th floor amenity space with rooftop terraces

Preliminary Design Commission Review:

This project received a preliminary Design Commission review on December 11, 2018. Highlights of the Design Commission feedback from that meeting are as follows:

- **General Comments:**
 - The Design Commission was in favor of the overall style and design direction for the three buildings, except one of the Commissioners felt that the designs of three buildings should be more cohesive, more innovative, and include more sustainable design features.
- **Chestnut Avenue Building:**
 - The two gables on the front elevation were encouraged to be omitted.
 - Additional design development to highlight the front entry was encouraged.
 - The keystone detailing in that flat arches was discouraged.
 - Detailing of the ramp walls leading to the underground garage was encouraged.
 - One Commissioner did not like the cornice design or cornice materials.
- **Campbell Street Building:**
 - Additional design development of the west façade was encouraged to add more interest to the design.
 - Increasing the height of the first floor stone base was encouraged.
 - Increasing the thickness of the thin cornice brackets was encouraged.
 - Clarification of the balcony support structure was requested.
 - Further study of the bumpout on the north elevation was encouraged to resolve the imbalance of having windows on one side, but not the other.
 - One Commissioner did not like the cornice design or cornice materials, stating that foam brackets and PVC panels are not sustainable building materials.
- **Highland Avenue Building:**
 - There was concern about the appearance of the glass curtain walls at the garage levels on the north and south elevations being dark at night and looking different from the apartment level curtain walls above. Further study and design development of this area was encouraged.
 - One Commissioner did not agree with matching the existing Village garage design at the garage levels, had concerns about the solar heat gain of the glass curtain wall at the apartment levels, and felt the cornice detail at the top of the building should be more modern.
 - One Commissioner was opposed to the large “44” sign at the top of the building.

Project Update:

Based on the feedback received at the preliminary Design Commission review, the petitioner has made the following changes to the proposed design:

- **Chestnut Avenue Building:**
 - The two gables on the front elevation have been omitted.
 - The design of the main entrance has been enhanced with a raised stone base.
 - The keystone detailing in that flat arches has been omitted.
 - A form liner pattern has been added to the ramp walls leading to the underground garage.
- **Campbell Street Building:**
 - The east and west facades have been enhanced with a taller stone base and a raised cornice to accentuate the center bay feature.
 - The stone base has been increased to the middle of the second floor windows on all sides of the building, and the

- height of the drive-through entrance has been raised.
 - The thin cornice brackets have been widened.
 - Hanger rods have been added to the balconies.
 - The windows on the side of the north elevation bumpout have been omitted.
- Highland Avenue Building:
 - The glass curtain walls at the garage levels on the north and south elevations have been omitted.
 - The large “44” sign at the top of the building has been omitted.

Staff Comments:

- General Comments:
 - Exterior Materials. Overall, the exterior materials are quality, durable stone & masonry materials, which are nicely coordinated and work well together, providing a cohesive feeling throughout the development.
- Chestnut Avenue Building:
 - Overall, the proposed design is very nicely done. The proposed traditional style and detailing will work very well in this location.
 - The decorative cornice and bay windows add richness to the design.
 - The alternating brick colors and individual entry porticos at the ground floor units provide a nice residential scale and give the building a rowhome feel.
- Campbell Street Building:
 - Overall, the proposed design is very nicely done, and it will fit in very well with the character of the adjacent Downtown buildings.
 - The character of the first floor retail is well defined from the upper façade, and includes wall space for future retail signage.
 - The only comment on the design is to clarify the color of the stone trim pieces, which are illustrated as white in the renderings, but are not labeled on the architectural elevations. The raised stone bay on the east & west ends has a thick white cap that appears oversized. It is recommended that this detail be revised to match the stone cap at the drive-through bay on the north elevation.
- Highland Avenue Building:
 - The garage levels are nicely designed to match the existing adjacent Village garage.
 - The glass curtain wall façade of the upper tower is distinctly different from other buildings in the Downtown and should be evaluated by the Design Commission.
 - Further design development of the north and south elevations is encouraged to better integrate the upper glass residential floors with the garage levels and building entrance below, similar to the center portion of the west elevation, which is nicely balanced and carries the brick material up into the residential floors.
 - The main entrance to the building on the north wall is understated for a luxury rental building. It is recommended that the design of the main entrance be enhanced with a grand appearance, and better integrated with the upper residential floors.
 - The west elevation includes a nicely designed curved curtain wall bay window feature in the center of the wall. It is recommended that this feature also be included on the east elevation to enhance the appearance of the east wall.
 - The first floor of the south wall is large and blank. It is recommended that openings be added to break up the large wall area. However, consideration should be given to vehicle headlights circulating inside the garage.

Mechanical Equipment, Utility Equipment, and Utility Meter Screening:

All mechanical equipment, utility equipment, and utility meters are required to be screened from public view. All three buildings include perimeter parapet walls to screen the rooftop mechanical equipment.

All wall-mounted equipment and meters must also be screened from view. The site plan indicates preliminary meter locations on the side and rear of the buildings. Where possible, all equipment and meters should be inside the buildings. For equipment that is required to be on the exterior, it shall be located on the side or rear elevations, away from the public walks, and enclosed with decorative metal screens.

Signage:

The only proposed signs are wall-mounted street addresses on each building mounted above the main entrance. Separate sign permits and detailed sign plans will be required, but the proposed signs are nicely designed and appear to be code compliant. The petitioner should clarify the proposed sign materials and if/how the signs will be illuminated.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the Design Commission **approve** the proposed architectural designs for the 33 S. Chestnut Avenue and 225 W. Campbell Street buildings, and **evaluate** the proposed architectural design for the 44 S. Highland Avenue building. This recommendation is based on, and subject to compliance with, the plans received 1/14/19, Design Commission recommendations, compliance with all applicable Federal, State, and Village codes regulations and policies, the issuance of all required permits, and the following:

1. Campbell Street building. Clarify the color of the stone trim pieces. The raised stone bay on the east & west ends has a thick white cap that appears oversized, and it is recommended that this detail be revised to match the stone cap at the drive-through bay on the north elevation.
2. Highland Avenue building. Evaluate the proposed curtain wall facades on the north and south elevations, and consider options to better integrate the upper glass residential floors with the garage levels and building entrance below, similar to the center portion of the west elevation, which is nicely balanced and carries the brick material up into the residential floors.
3. Highland Avenue building. It is recommended that the design of the main entrance on the north elevation be enhanced with a grand appearance, and better integrated with the upper residential floors.
4. Highland Avenue building. It is recommended that a curved curtain wall bay window be added to the east elevation, to match the west elevation.
5. Highland Avenue building. It is recommended that wall openings be added to the first floor of the south wall to break up the large blank wall area. However, consideration should be given to vehicle headlights circulating inside the garage.
6. Where possible, all equipment and meters should be inside the buildings. For equipment that is required to be on the exterior, it shall be located on the side or rear elevations, away from the public walks, and enclosed with decorative metal screens.
7. Clarify the proposed address sign materials and if/how the signs will be illuminated.
8. This review deals with architectural design only and should not be construed to be an approval of, or to have any other impact on, any other zoning and/or land use issues or decisions that stem from zoning, sign code or building or any other reviews. In addition to the normal technical review, permit drawings will be reviewed for consistency with the Design Commission and any other Commission or Board approval conditions. It is the architect/owner/builder's responsibility to comply with the Design Commission approval and ensure that building permit plans and sign permit plans comply with all zoning code, building code and sign code requirements.

_____, January 29, 2019

Steve Hautzinger AIA, Design Planner
Department of Planning & Community Development

Cc: Charles Witherington Perkins, Director of Planning and Community Development, Bill Enright, Deputy Director of Planning and Community Development, Sam Hubbard, Development Planner, Petitioner, DC File 18-104

PRELIMINARY STAFF DESIGN COMMISSION REPORT

PROJECT INFORMATION:

Project Name: Arlington Block 425
Project Address: 225 W. Campbell Street
44 S. Highland Avenue
33 S. Chestnut Avenue

Prepared By: Steve Hautzinger
Date Prepared: December 4, 2018

PETITIONER INFORMATION:

DC Number: 18-104
Petitioner Name: Michael Firsell
Petitioner Address: Firsell Ross
2801 Lakeside Drive
Bannockburn, IL 60015

Meeting Date: December 11, 2018

Requested Action(s):

Preliminary review of the proposed architectural designs for three new multi-story apartment buildings in the Downtown.

Design Commission Responsibility for Projects Being Reviewed by Plan Commission:

The subject design is being forwarded to the Design Commission for review pursuant to Chapter 6 of the Municipal Code.

This project requires Plan Commission review and Village Board approval for Rezoning, PUD, Land Use Variation, and other variations. Because this project is going to the Plan Commission, the role of the Design Commission is limited. The Design Commission's responsibility is as outlined in Chapter 28 of the Municipal Code, Section 14.2-1, which states:

*"For developments where a public hearing is necessary before the Plan Commission or Zoning Board of Appeals, the design review process should, if feasible, be completed by the time of the public hearing. Development proposals requiring rezoning, PUD or other Plan Commission approvals, shall be reviewed by the Design Commission **for building and signage only.**"*

Summary:

The petitioner is proposing three new buildings on the northern three-fourths of the existing vacant Block 425 in the Downtown:

- Chestnut Avenue Building:
 - 4 stories
 - 54 apartments
 - Underground parking
 - Rooftop terrace
- Campbell Street Building:
 - 9 stories
 - First floor retail space
 - Second floor commercial/retail/office space
 - 182 apartments, floors 3 through 9
 - Rooftop terrace
- Highland Avenue Building:
 - 13 stories
 - First floor retail space and parking garage
 - Parking garage, floors 2 through 6
 - 125 apartments, floors 7 through 12
 - 13th floor amenity space with rooftop terraces

Preliminary Building Design Comments: (based on drawings received 11/27/18)

- **General Comments:**
 - Exterior Materials. Very nice quality durable materials (stone & masonry). Overall, nicely coordinated materials work well together, and tie the development together.
- **Chestnut Avenue Building:**
 - Overall, the proposed design looks great. Beautiful traditional style and detailing will work very well in this location.
 - The decorative cornice and bay windows add richness to the design.
 - Alternating brick colors and individual entry porticos at the ground floor units provide a nice residential scale and give the building a rowhome feel.
 - The two brick colors may not have enough contrast. Consider a new brick selection with slightly more contrast to accentuate the alternating brick appearance.
 - The two inner porticos are less impactful because of the single masonry pier and the lack of a railing above. Consider changing the detailing of the two inner porticos to match the design and detailing of the two outermost porticos.
 - The two gables at the top of the building add interest to the roofline and help balance the center mansard roof. However, the gables are too shallow and have a fake appearance.
 - It is recommended that the gable depth be extended further back, at least 12 feet, for a more substantial appearance.
- **Campbell Street Building:**
 - Overall, the proposed design is very nicely done, and it will fit in very well with the character of the adjacent Downtown buildings.
 - The character of the first floor retail is well defined from the upper façade, and includes wall space for future retail signage.
 - For the final review, it is recommended that the rendering be adjusted to more accurately depict the proposed bronze tinted glazing, instead of the bright blue color as currently shown.
- **Highland Avenue Building:**
 - The garage levels are nicely designed to match the existing adjacent Village garage.
 - The upper glass curtain wall façade is distinctly different from other buildings in the Downtown and should be evaluated by the Design Commission.
 - Consider integrating vertical masonry piers to break down the large expanses of glass into sections, similar to the curtain wall detailing on the north elevation of the proposed Campbell building.
 - Confirm that the curtain wall glazing will not be highly reflective.
 - For the final review, it is recommended that the rendering be adjusted to more accurately depict the proposed bronze tinted glazing, instead of the bright blue color as currently shown.
 - The architectural elevations and renderings should be updated to show the ground floor retail storefront on the north elevation.
 - The garage level floor plans should be updated to show the openings and jogs in the exterior walls.

Mechanical Equipment, Utility Equipment, and Utility Meter Screening:

All mechanical equipment, utility equipment, and utility meters are required to be screened from public view. All three buildings include perimeter parapet walls to screen the rooftop mechanical equipment.

Additional details are required to confirm the locations and screening for all building-mounted utility equipment and meters. A preliminary utility plan needs to be provided to coordinate the locations and screening of all equipment, including exterior ground-mounted equipment.

Preliminary Signage Comments:

The only signage proposed at this time are two street address signs on the Highland Building:

- North Elevation: A “44 S. Highland” wall sign is proposed above the main entrance. Additional signage details will be required, but the proposed sign appears to be nicely designed and code compliant.
- West Elevation: A large number “44” wall sign is proposed at the top of the building. Wall signs are not allowed above the second floor in the Downtown, so the proposed sign should either be omitted or a sign variation requested. The Design Commission should provide preliminary feedback on the proposed sign.

December 5, 2018

Steve Hautzinger AIA, Design Planner
Department of Planning & Community Development

Cc: Charles Witherington Perkins, Director of Planning and Community Development, Bill Enright, Deputy Director of Planning and Community Development, Sam Hubbard, Development Planner, Petitioner, DC File 18-104

SUMMARY OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE INTRODUCTORY NEIGHBORHOOD MEETING

OF THE ARLINGTON 425 DEVELOPMENT

HELD AT THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF CAMPBELL STREET AND HIGHLAND AVENUE ON:

September 9, 2018

Project Title: Arlington 425

Address: SW Corner of Campbell Street and Highland Avenue, Block 425

Prepared by: Jake Schmidt, Department of Planning and Community Development

Introduction

This neighborhood meeting was conducted in two separate sessions, one at 12:15 PM and one at 2:15 PM. Attendance was relatively high at each session, with an estimated 80 to 90 individuals at each session. Both sessions began with an introduction of the project, which comprised of a discussion of the current and requested zoning, the design and layout of the buildings, on-site parking, storm water detention, and a summary and explanation of the variations that will be requested. This initial presentation was conducted by Mike Firsell, of Firsell Ross, and Jim Tinaglia, of Tinaglia Architects. The second portion of both sessions was a question and answer period. For this question and answer period, separate stations were set up in the meeting tent addressing different aspects of the project - those being Architecture, Landscaping, Traffic, and Storm Water. Members of the public could walk from station to station to ask questions of the experts present. What follows is a list of the comments and concerns observed at each station, along with the general impression of public feedback at each station.

Architecture

The feedback at this station was generally positive. Most members of the public seemed pleased with the design and layout of the buildings, however impressions were mixed on the tallest, Highland Avenue building.

Observed Comments and Concerns:

- The proposal would be a "beautiful addition" to Arlington Heights
- Concerns that the bigger buildings will block sunlight, to the inner courtyard and in the general area
- The location of a center courtyard for traffic circulation and deliveries is a "good idea"
- The building on Highland is "a lot"
- Would rather see "the biggest building be smaller, and the smallest building be a bit bigger" rather than have one big tower and a smaller building in front
- The building on Highland seems to look "institutional"
- The location of the Highland Building "makes sense"
- The proposal "looks nicer than expected"
- "Oh wow"
- "Looks nice"

Landscaping

The feedback at this station was generally positive. Members of the public seemed pleased with the proposed landscaping and proposed site features.

Observed Comments and Concerns:

- Will the ground floor outdoor spaces be open to the public?
- The greenery "looks pretty"
- There is "a lot of green" incorporated into the design
- Will there be an area for development residents to walk dogs?

Traffic

The majority of negative comments observed were related to traffic. Members of the public were generally concerned with the amount of traffic that would be generated by the site, as well as the impact on the intersection at Campbell and Highland. Many expressed that they felt the intersection was already dangerous, and that the addition of the primary driveway on Highland would increase both the volume, confusion, and danger at this intersection. Many expressed the desire to add a 3-way stop or other traffic control measure at this intersection.

Observed Comments and Concerns:

- How will moving trucks access the Chestnut building?
- Location of deliveries and trash collection – How will trucks be directed to access the inner courtyard rather than parking on the street?
- How will guests or patrons of the development be prevented from utilizing street parking on Chestnut and on the surrounding streets?
- The intersection at Highland and Campbell is currently a “blind corner” and unsafe – development will increase issues
- Suggestion that 1-way streets could alleviate concerns/improve traffic flow to and from the development
- Why is there no access to the center court/parking areas from the west side of the development?
- Seems like on-site parking will be hard to access for residents on the west side of the Campbell Building
- There is no shared access between the existing public garage and the development garage – how will customers/guests know to access the on-site garage rather than driving into and using the public garage?
- Traffic studies should also show impacts on neighborhood streets, beyond those adjacent to the development.
- Stop signs should be added to the intersection at Campbell and Highland, and at Sigwalt and Highland

Storm Water

The feedback at this station was generally neutral. This station was observed to have the lowest number of questions and concerns; however some members of the public did stop by to express concerns about sewer capacity. Specifically, that this development, even with storm water detention facilities proposed, was still more intense than the uses previously located on the site, and would consequently produce greater amounts of sewage.

Observed Comments and Concerns:

- Will existing sewers be able to accommodate the need from these three buildings?
- Don't want “sewage backing up into my basement”

General

Overall, the impressions expressed by members of the public seemed positive. Many liked the site design and landscaping. There were no comments observed regarding the proposed density, and few regarding the height of the buildings. Traffic and parking was the most concerning facet of the proposal, with concerns primarily focused on how delivery/service trucks, customers, and guests will be directed to use the on-site parking facilities rather than on-street or public garage spaces. The impact on traffic was also a primary concern, both on the surrounding streets and on the neighborhood as a whole, in addition to the impact the development would have on the intersections of Highland/Campbell and Highland/Sigwalt, which are perceived as dangerous at present. Below are some general comments and questions observed, which did not deal specifically with the stations and aspects described above.

Observed Comments and Concerns:

- How likely will the units in the Chestnut building be condominiums?
- How will the developer be addressing the Affordable Housing Requirement? Will there be a “buy-out”?
- What is the anticipated customer base for the apartments? What is the anticipated age/demographics?
- What will the rents be for these units?
- What will the uses be in the proposed retail spaces?
- Development on this site “is a matter of time”, just want to be sure it will be done in a way that preserves safety

Arlington425 – Site Aerial





MICHAEL D. FIRSEL
MICHAEL E. ROSS
CHRISTINE S. BOLGER
KAREN JERWOOD
STEPHEN E. ROSS

2801 LAKESIDE DRIVE, SUITE 207
BANNOCKBURN, IL 60015

O 847-582-9900
F 847-582-9933

www.firsellross.com

March 15, 2019

Mr. Terrence Ennes and
Members of the Plan Commission of the
Village of Arlington Heights
33 S. Arlington Heights Road
Arlington Heights, IL 60005-1403

Re: REVISED - Request of CCH LLC ("Petitioner") for Plan Commission Hearing and Recommendation - Arlington 425 / CCH LLC - Temporary File Number T1599

Dear Terrence:

Please consider this letter the revised formal request of CCH LLC, the Owner of the property referenced herein, to present Petitioner's proposed project, known as "**Arlington 425**", before the Plan Commission of the Village, for review and recommendation to the Village Board.

As you are aware, Petitioner is proposing a new Class A mixed-use development on the 2.868 acre parcel of vacant land identified as "Block 425" in the Village of Arlington Heights Downtown Master Plan (the "**Property**"), located between Campbell Street on the north, Highland Avenue (and the Vail Street parking garage) on the east, Chestnut Avenue on the west, and 150' north of Sigwalt Street on the south. The undersigned has been authorized to submit this letter to the Village for and on behalf of the Owner/Petitioner of the Arlington 425 project (the "**Project**").

The Project will involve the construction of three new buildings on the currently vacant Property.

1. One building located along Campbell Street (the "**Campbell Building**"), will be a nine-story building with commercial (including retail, restaurant and office space on the first two floors, and 182 rental apartments on the top seven floors, consisting of 42 studios, 98 one-bedroom and 42 two-bedroom apartments.
2. A second building located along Highland Avenue (the "**Highland Building**"), will be a thirteen-story building with the first six floors consisting of a 460-space parking garage, the next six floors containing 125 apartments consisting of 41 studios, 60 one-bedroom,

Mr. Terrence Ennes, et.al.

March 15, 2019

Page 2

and 24 two-bedroom, with the top floor containing a 12,894 square foot amenity space (possibly including a restaurant).

3. The third building (the “**Chestnut Building**”), located along Chestnut Avenue, will be a four-story building currently planned all multi-family residential, including 54 units, consisting of 4 studios, 20 one-bedroom and 30 two-bedroom units. Two levels of underground parking will consist of approximately 84 parking spaces.

It is currently contemplated that the Project will be constructed in two phases. The first phase will include the Campbell Building, the Highland Building, a portion of the underground parking garage for the Chestnut building, as well as all project infrastructure and common areas, with only the construction of the Chestnut Building (and the remaining portion of the underground parking garage) as the second phase.

The parcel on which the Project is located currently consists of 17 lots, of which 13 are zoned B-5, and four are zoned R-3. Owner is seeking to consolidate the 17 lots into a one lot Planned Unit Development, with B-5 as the underlying zoning for the entire Property. As a result of this consolidation, Owner is seeking a variation to Chapter 28, § 5.1-14.4 to allow the inclusion of the proposed all residential Chestnut Building containing dwelling units below the second floor within the B-5 District. The Chestnut Building will be located directly across the street from several single-family residences. Please see Petitioner’s “**Written Justification for Land Use Variations**” for a more in-depth explanation of the necessity for this variance.

In addition to the above, Petitioner is seeking very few variances to the Village’s Zoning Code, each of which Petitioner believes are justified and necessary. Three variations are also being sought to Chapter 28, §5.1-14.6, Required Minimum Yards: (i) to reduce the required interior yard setback (south) from 25 feet to 12.9 feet for the building along Highland Avenue, (ii) to reduce the required public street frontage setback (west) from 20 feet to 7 feet for the Campbell Building, and (iii) to reduce the required public street frontage from 20 feet to 12.2 feet for the Chestnut Building. A final variation is sought to Chapter 28, § 10.2-7, Size, to allow certain parking spaces (approximately 10) within the Highland Building garage to be 15.3’ in depth (for motorcycles and compact cars) where code requires 18’ in depth. Please see Petitioner’s “**Written Justification for Land Use Variations**” for a more in-depth explanation of the necessity of these variances.

Petitioner is not seeking any parking variances. Based on the number and type of residential units being proposed, 386 parking spaces are required for the Project’s residential uses, and approximately 67 parking spaces are required for the currently contemplated commercial uses for a total of 453 parking spaces. Petitioner currently plans to construct a six-story parking structure

Mr. Terrence Ennes, et.al.

March 15, 2019

Page 3


as well as underground parking spaces totaling 544 parking spaces. The surplus of 91 spaces is well in excess of code requirements.

Petitioner is not seeking any Zoning Code variances for height or density.

Green features and sustainable design are, or will be, included in the final plans, which will include, but not be limited to:

1. Owner will use its best reasonable efforts to obtain Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) certification for the Project;
2. Large sections of the roof on each of the Chestnut Building and the Campbell building will include greenspaces, as shown on the renderings provided by Petitioner;
3. There will be multiple trees along Campbell Street, Highland Avenue, and Chestnut Avenue, all as depicted in Petitioner's landscape plans;
4. All required above-ground utilities will be properly screened;
5. Permeable pavers to allow infiltration, reducing runoff volume and improving water quality;
6. Many recommended products are manufactured locally, or are produced using recycled content;
7. Full cut-off lighting will be used to reduce light pollution,
8. LED light source will be reduced throughout to reduce energy consumption and extend lifespan of fixtures;
9. Smart control irrigation system will reduce water consumption;
10. Windows will meet minimum U-factors per the energy code;
11. Originally contemplated PVC trim elements have been removed;
12. All appliances will be energy star rated;
13. Bicycle racks are being provided throughout to encourage less automobile use and therefore, less petroleum usage;
14. Vehicle electrical charging stations will be included in the garages to accommodate and promote the use of energy efficient vehicles; and
15. Owner will continue to promote and implement green features and sustainable design elements during the final planning and design process.

Petitioner looks forward to presenting this project before the Village Plan Commission and Board of Trustees for review and approval.

Sincerely,

Michael D. Firsell



MICHAEL D. FIRSEL
MICHAEL E. ROSS
CHRISTINE S. BOLGER
KAREN JERWOOD
STEPHEN E. ROSS

2801 LAKESIDE DRIVE, SUITE 207
BANNOCKBURN, IL 60015

O 847-582-9900
F 847-582-9933

www.firsellross.com

March 22, 2019

Mr. Terrence Ennes and Members of
the Plan Commission of the
Village of Arlington Heights
33 S. Arlington Heights Rd.
Arlington Heights, IL 60005-1403

Re: Arlington 425 / CCH LLC - PC#: 19-001

LAND USE VARIATION CRITERIA

A. Variation to Chapter 28, Section 5.1-14.1, Conditions of Use, to allow dwelling units below the second floor in the building along Chestnut Avenue ("Chestnut Building").

- 1. The proposed use will not alter the essential character of the locality and will be compatible with existing uses and zoning of nearby property.*

Correct. Although one of the several lots on which the Chestnut Building will be built is currently zoned R-3, Petitioner seeks to rezone the four of the seventeen lots to B-5 in the interest of creating a PUD consolidating all seventeen lots into a single lot with the same underlying zoning. Multi-family residential buildings are not permitted in the B-5 District as a matter of right under the Village's current zoning ordinances. However, Petitioner believes that it is prudent, better planning and more desirable for the underlying zoning for the entire parcel PUD to be B-5. The proposed site of the Chestnut Building is directly across the street from an R-6 District, consisting of several single-family residences. Hence, construction of the Chestnut Building will not alter the essential character of the locality, and is compatible with existing uses and nearby zoning.

- 2. The plight of the owner is due to unique circumstances, which may include the length of time the subject property has been vacant as zoned.*

Correct. The property has been vacant for a long time. As a result, it is more feasible to develop the property as a single, cohesive lot rather than to individually develop each lot piecemeal. Because the underlying zoning designation of Petitioner's proposed lot will be

Mr. Terrence Ennes and Members of
the Plan Commission of the
Village of Arlington Heights
March 22, 2019
Page 2

B-5, this variation is necessary. Additionally, by developing the Chestnut Building as an all residential building, Petitioner hopes to ease the fears that any neighboring residents might have about a commercial development altering the character Chestnut Avenue and the neighborhood as a whole.

3. *The proposed variation is in harmony with the spirit and intent of this Chapter.*

Correct. It is the intention of the Village Zoning Code "[t]o protect the character and stability of the residential, business and manufacturing areas within the Village and to promote the orderly and beneficial development of such areas." Petitioner seeks to develop the Chestnut Building as an all residential building to promote the orderly development of Block 425. The strictly residential nature of the Chestnut Building will help with the transition from the neighboring R-6 District homes on the west and R-3 District, to the other mixed-use buildings being proposed on Block 425, to the B-5 District on the other side of Block 425.

4. *The variance requested is the minimum variance necessary to allow reasonable use of the property.*

Correct. Petitioner seeks to develop the Chestnut Building as 100% residential in order to promote the cohesive development of the entire project as mixed-use and in accordance with the residential character of those properties to the west of the Chestnut Building. For the Chestnut Building to be strictly residential, Petitioner will need to utilize the entire first floor for residential use.

B. Variation to Chapter 28, Section 5.1-14.2, Required Minimum Yards, to allow a 12.9' setback along an interior lot line (southern lot line) for the building along Highland Avenue ("Highland Building") where code requires a 25' setback.

1. *The proposed use will not alter the essential character of the locality and will be compatible with existing uses and zoning of nearby property.*

Correct. Petitioner is seeking this variance due to the location of the existing Vail Avenue parking garage which extends over Highland Avenue and abuts the subject property. To remedy this, Petitioner seeks to align the south end of the Highland Building with the south end of the Vail Avenue parking garage, thereby reducing the above-referenced setback from 25 feet to 12.9 feet. This variance will create a uniform

Mr. Terrence Ennes and Members of
the Plan Commission of the
Village of Arlington Heights
March 22, 2019
Page 3

and more aesthetically compatible appearance that does not alter the essential character of the locality. Petitioner also notes that a paved walkway is proposed adjacent to the southern side of the Highland Building, and no structures will be built within this area.

2. *The plight of the owner is due to unique circumstances, which may include the length of time the subject property has been vacant as zoned.*

Correct. The Vail Avenue parking garage is a unique obstacle that Petitioner has taken great strides to overcome. This requested variation is one of those great strides that Petitioner seeks to utilize to overcome this obstacle, specifically by allowing the south end of the Highland Building to align directly with the south end of the Vail Avenue parking garage.

3. *The proposed variation is in harmony with the spirit and intent of this Chapter.*

Correct. It is the intention of the Village Zoning Code "[t]o protect the character and stability of the residential, business and manufacturing areas within the Village and to promote the orderly and beneficial development of such areas." Petitioner seeks to develop the lower portion of the Highland Building as a parking garage aligning with the pre-existing Vail Avenue parking garage as a means to beneficially develop the land in an orderly fashion. By developing the Highland Building in a manner consistent with the Vail Avenue parking garage, Petitioner is adhering to the orderly development of the project.

4. *The variance requested is the minimum variance necessary to allow reasonable use of the property.*

Correct. As previously stated, the location and dimensions of the Vail Avenue parking garage limits Petitioner's development opportunities. Petitioner is requesting the minimum setback variance to allow for the Highland Building to align with the Vail Avenue parking garage.

C. Variation to Chapter 28, § 5.1-14.6, Required Minimum Yards to reduce the required public street frontage setback (west) from 20 feet to 7 feet for the building along Campbell Street ("Campbell Building")

1. *The proposed use will not alter the essential character of the locality and will be compatible with existing uses and zoning of nearby property.*

Mr. Terrence Ennes and Members of
the Plan Commission of the
Village of Arlington Heights
March 22, 2019
Page 4

Correct. The Campbell Building will be bordered on the east by the B-5 District and on the west by the R-6 District. The imposition of the eight foot right-of-way required dedication severely impacts this property. The bottom floor of the Campbell Building will be commercial with the eastern portion likely containing a restaurant, and the western portion containing a more active retail or commercial use. In order to accommodate outdoor seating at the restaurant on the eastern portion of the building, Petitioner is seeking to push the building further west with a setback variation on the western side. But for the moving of the Campbell building further west and the required eight foot dedication, requirement this variance would not be required

2. *The plight of the owner is due to unique circumstances, which may include the length of time the subject property has been vacant as zoned.*

Correct. The property has been vacant for a long time and is bordered by residential and commercial districts. This requested variance is a means to develop the property in accordance with the nature of the adjacent properties/ districts which contrast with one another.

3. *The proposed variation is in harmony with the spirit and intent of this Chapter.*

Correct. One of the intentions of the Village Zoning Code is "[t]o protect the character and stability of the residential, business and manufacturing areas within the Village and to promote the orderly and beneficial development of such areas." Because the Campbell Building is bordered on the east by the B-5 District, a restaurant with outdoor seating is appropriate on the Campbell Building's east side. Such a development would be both orderly and beneficial considering the character of the neighboring property.

4. *The variance requested is the minimum variance necessary to allow reasonable use of the property.*

Correct. This variance is the minimum necessary to allow for outdoor seating at the restaurant on the first floor of the Campbell Building. A restaurant is a reasonable use considering the bordering B-5 District and the popularity of outdoor seating downtown during the warmer months.

Mr. Terrence Ennes and Members of
the Plan Commission of the
Village of Arlington Heights
March 22, 2019
Page 5

D. Variation to Chapter 28, Section 5.1-14.2, Required Minimum Yards, to allow a 12.2' setback along a public street frontage (Chestnut Street) for the Chestnut building where code requires a 20' setback.

1. *The proposed use will not alter the essential character of the locality and will be compatible with existing uses and zoning of nearby property.*

Correct. Petitioner seeks to develop the Chestnut Building as all residential. Because the Chestnut Building will be adjacent to the R-6 District, this use will be compatible with the zoning of nearby property. However, the requirement of a fire lane between the Chestnut building and the Highland Building, coupled with the need for adequate space between these buildings, affects Petitioner's ability to setback the Chestnut building further from the street. Hence, the requested variation.

2. *The plight of the owner is due to unique circumstances, which may include the length of time the subject property has been vacant as zoned.*

Correct. The property has been vacant for many years. To develop the property in the most beneficial fashion, consistent with its location on the edge of downtown, this variation is required; specifically, due to the required fire lane and the need to properly space the buildings.

3. *The proposed variation is in harmony with the spirit and intent of this Chapter.*

Correct. It is the intention of the Village Zoning Code "[t]o protect the character and stability of the residential, business and manufacturing areas within the Village and to promote the orderly and beneficial development of such areas." This project promotes the orderly and beneficial development consistent with the unique nature of this and the neighboring properties.

4. *The variance requested is the minimum variance necessary to allow reasonable use of the property.*

Correct. In order to accommodate the proper and orderly development of the property, the requested setback is the minimum required.

Mr. Terrence Ennes and Members of
the Plan Commission of the
Village of Arlington Heights
March 22, 2019
Page 6

E. Variation to Chapter 28, Section 10.2-7, Size, to allow certain parking spaces within the Highland Building garage to be 15.3' in depth where code requires 18' in depth.

1. *The proposed use will not alter the essential character of the locality and will be compatible with existing uses and zoning of nearby property.*

Correct. Since all parking stalls are inside of the garage there will not be any incompatibility with existing uses and zoning of nearby property.

2. *The plight of the owner is due to unique circumstances, which may include the length of time the subject property has been vacant as zoned.*

Correct. The unique circumstances are that in order to provide as many parking stalls as possible, the reduction in the length of these few stalls is necessary. They can easily be reserved for motorcycles or compact cars. If this variance is not allowed, these spaces will be eliminated.

3. *The proposed variation is in harmony with the spirit and intent of this Chapter.*

Correct. Nothing about the reduction of the length of these parking stalls will in any way disrupt the harmony with the spirit and intent of this Chapter.

4. *The variance requested is the minimum variance necessary to allow reasonable use of the property.*

Correct. Based on the required width of drive aisles and other Code requirements, the requested variance is the minimum necessary to allow the use of these parking stalls.

F. Variation to Chapter 29, Section 29-304(l), to allow a 50' wide right-of-way for a local street where code requires a 66' wide right-of-way for local streets, along certain portions of Highland Avenue.

1. *The proposed use will not alter the essential character of the locality and will be compatible with existing uses and zoning of nearby property.*

Correct. The Vail Avenue parking garage is built on the property line. No 66' right of way is physically possible under the Vail Avenue parking garage.

Mr. Terrence Ennes and Members of
the Plan Commission of the
Village of Arlington Heights
March 22, 2019
Page 7

2. *The plight of the owner is due to unique circumstances, which may include the length of time the subject property has been vacant as zoned.*

Correct. The unique circumstances are that the Village constructed the Vail Avenue parking garage in such a way as to make a 66' right-of-way impossible.

3. *The proposed variation is in harmony with the spirit and intent of this Chapter.*

Correct. Nothing about the reduction in the right of way of Highland Avenue under the Vail Avenue parking garage will in any way disrupt the spirit and intent of this Chapter.

4. *The variance requested is the minimum variance necessary to allow reasonable use of the property.*

Correct. This variance was necessitated when the extension of the Vail Avenue parking garage was built. Petitioner has no ability to widen the right of way due to the existence of the Vail Avenue parking garage.

G. Variation to Chapter 28, Section 6.15-2.2, Landscape Requirements between Zoning Districts, to waive the requirement for a 6-foot tall solid screen along the southern property line.

1. *The proposed use will not alter the essential character of the locality and will be compatible with existing uses and zoning of nearby property.*

Correct. Although the property is zoned B-5 along the southern property line adjacent to the Chestnut Building, the Chestnut Building will be residential only, which is consistent with the possible R-7 zoning of the southern adjacent parcel. The screening requirement is more applicable to business uses that abut residential property; however, along the southern property line, both the Highland Building and Chestnut Building will be residential. Additionally, a retaining wall will need to be constructed along the southern property line up to three feet in height. The property to the south is not developed and can provide screening along this boundary between the two properties should it be determined that a screen is warranted at the time of its development. There is not sufficient room to install a landscape screen or berm along the southern property line. Therefore, the only way to meet the screening requirement would be to install a six-foot



Mr. Terrence Ennes and Members of
the Plan Commission of the
Village of Arlington Heights
March 22, 2019
Page 8

tall solid fence. Because the retaining wall may be up to three feet in height at certain portions, a six foot tall fence plus three-foot tall retaining wall would create a nine-foot barrier that would be out of character on the otherwise flat lot. Petitioner is willing to construct an “open” screen on top of the retaining wall, if possible.

2. *The plight of the owner is due to unique circumstances, which may include the length of time the subject property has been vacant as zoned.*

Correct. The property has been vacant for a long time. As a result, it is more feasible to develop the property as a single, cohesive lot. Because the underlying zoning designation of Petitioner’s proposed lot will be B-5, and the retaining wall will not allow for construction of a six foot solid barrier, this variation is necessary.

3. *The proposed variation is in harmony with the spirit and intent of this Chapter.*

Correct. Among the zoning code’s intents is “[t]o protect the character and stability of the residential, business and manufacturing areas within the Village and to promote the orderly and beneficial development of such areas.” The construction of a six foot tall solid screen would be out of character with the development of the surrounding area.

4. *The variance requested is the minimum variance necessary to allow reasonable use of the property.*

Correct. Although Petitioner will be unable to construct a six-foot solid screen, Petitioner is willing to construct a six-foot open screen along the southern property line.

Should you require and further information or clarification, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads 'Michael D. Firsell'. Below the signature, the name 'Michael D. Firsell' is printed in a black, sans-serif font.

Michael D. Firsell


ALTA/NSPS LAND TITLE SURVEY

BY
JOHN M. HENRIKSEN
415 E. GOLF ROAD - SUITE 103 ARLINGTON HEIGHTS, ILLINOIS 60005
TEL. 224-875-7633 FAX. 224-875-7634
WWW.HENRIKSENSURVEY.COM



PARCEL 1:
LOTS 1 TO 10 AND LOTS 18 TO 23 IN A SUBDIVISION OF LOTS 26, 27, 28 AND 29 IN ASSESSOR'S DIVISION OF SECTION 30, TOWNSHIP 42 NORTH, RANGE 11 EAST OF THE THIRD PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, IN COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS.

PARCEL 3:
LOT 11 IN BLOCK 2 IN A SUBDIVISION OF LOTS 26, 27, 28 AND 29 IN ASSESSOR'S DIVISION OF SECTION 30, TOWNSHIP 42 NORTH, RANGE 11 EAST OF THE THIRD PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, IN COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS.

TOTAL AREA OF SURVEY: 124,964 SQ. FEET OR 2.8688 ACRES



VICINITY MAP



NOTES:

UTILITY INFORMATION IS BASED UPON FIELD MEASUREMENTS, AND THE BEST AVAILABLE RECORDS. FIELD DATA IS LIMITED TO THAT WHICH IS VISIBLE AND CAN BE MEASURED. THIS DOES NOT PRECLUDE THE EXISTENCE OF OTHER UNDERGROUND UTILITIES. RECORD INFORMATION IS BASED UPON DATA COLLECTED FROM BOTH PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SOURCES. THE COMPLETENESS AND ACCURACY OF THESE RECORDS CANNOT BE GUARANTEED, EXCEPT INsofar AS THEY CAN BE VERIFIED BY FIELD MEASUREMENT.

WARNING:
GAS MAINS ARE CONSIDERED "CLASSIFIED INFORMATION" PLEASE CALL "JULIE" AT 1-800-892-6123 TO HAVE UTILITIES MARKED ON THE GROUND AT THIS LOCATION AND WE WILL ADD THAT INFORMATION TO THIS DRAWING.

NO BUILDINGS OR FOUNDATIONS ARE VISIBLE ON THE SURVEYED PROPERTY. THIS DOES NOT PRECLUDE THE EXISTENCE OF BURIED FOUNDATIONS OR OTHER STRUCTURES NOT VISIBLE.

REFERENCE HAS BEEN MADE TO CHICAGO TITLE INSURANCE COMPANY COMMITMENT NUMBER 1410 00965884 UL, HAVING AN EFFECTIVE DATE OF OCTOBER 24, 2016 IN THE PREPARATION OF THIS SURVEY.

IN REGARDS TO SCHEDULE "B" EXCEPTIONS OF SAID TITLE COMMITMENT:

ITEM 13
EASEMENT GRANTED TO COMMONWEALTH EDISON RECORDED OCTOBER 5, 1984 AS DOCUMENT 27283996. (SHOWN ON SURVEY)

ITEM 14
EASEMENT FOR PUBLIC UTILITIES IN FAVOR OF COMMONWEALTH EDISON COMPANY AND ILLINOIS BELL TELEPHONE COMPANY AND THEIR RESPECTIVE SUCCESSORS AND ASSIGNS, AS RESERVED IN ORDINANCE OF VACATION RECORDED MARCH 29, 1973 AS DOCUMENT 21840159. (SHOWN ON SURVEY)

IN REGARDS TO TABLE "A" ITEMS OF THE MINIMUM STANDARD DETAIL REQUIREMENTS FOR ALTA/NSPS LAND TITLE SURVEYS:

ITEM 1 OF TABLE "A"

217 W. CAMPBELL	03-30-425-015-0000
217 W. CAMPBELL	03-30-425-016-0000
217 W. CAMPBELL	03-30-425-017-0000
26 S. HIGHLAND	03-30-425-018-0000
26 S. HIGHLAND	03-30-425-019-0000
26 S. HIGHLAND	03-30-425-020-0000
26 S. HIGHLAND	03-30-425-021-0000
26 S. HIGHLAND	03-30-425-022-0000
26 S. HIGHLAND	03-30-425-023-0000
26 S. HIGHLAND	03-30-425-024-0000
26 S. HIGHLAND	03-30-425-025-0000
26 S. HIGHLAND	03-30-425-026-0000
26 S. HIGHLAND	03-30-425-027-0000
26 S. HIGHLAND	03-30-425-028-0000
26 S. HIGHLAND	03-30-425-029-0000
26 S. HIGHLAND	03-30-425-030-0000
26 S. HIGHLAND	03-30-425-031-0000
26 S. HIGHLAND	03-30-425-032-0000
26 S. HIGHLAND	03-30-425-033-0000
26 S. HIGHLAND	03-30-425-034-0000
26 S. HIGHLAND	03-30-425-035-0000
26 S. HIGHLAND	03-30-425-036-0000
26 S. HIGHLAND	03-30-425-037-0000
26 S. HIGHLAND	03-30-425-038-0000
26 S. HIGHLAND	03-30-425-039-0000
26 S. HIGHLAND	03-30-425-040-0000

ITEM 1 OF TABLE "A"
ACCORDING TO THE FLOOD INSURANCE RATE MAP OF THE NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE PROGRAM FOR THIS AREA OF THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS, COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS, BEING COMMUNITY NUMBER 17065, PANEL 0303, MAP NUMBER TWO (CROSS) MAY REVEALED AUGUST 19, 2008, THE NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE PROGRAM HAS DETERMINED THAT THE AREA WITHIN THE PROPERTY HEREON DRAWN LIES WITHIN ITS
UNSHADDED ZONE "X", WHICH IS DEFINED AS AN AREA DETERMINED TO BE OUTSIDE THE 0.2 PERCENT ANNUAL CHANCE FLOODPLAIN
SHADDED ZONE "X", WHICH IS DEFINED AS AREAS OF 0.2 PERCENT ANNUAL CHANCE FLOOD, AREAS OF 1 PERCENT ANNUAL CHANCE FLOOD WITH AVERAGE DEPTHS OF LESS THAN 1 FOOT OR WITH DRAINAGE AREAS LESS THAN 1 SQUARE MILE, AND AREAS PROTECTED BY LEVEES FROM 1 PERCENT ANNUAL CHANCE FLOOD.

ITEM 11 OF TABLE "A"

NOTE TO CLIENT, INSURER, AND LENDER - WITH REGARD TO TABLE "A", ITEM 11, SOURCE INFORMATION FROM PLANS AND MARKINGS WILL BE COMBINED WITH OBSERVED EVIDENCE OF UTILITIES PUSANT TO SECTION 5.1.6. TO DEVELOP A VIEW OF THE UNDERGROUND UTILITIES. HOWEVER, LACKING EXCAVATION, THE EXACT LOCATION OF UNDERGROUND FEATURES CANNOT BE ACCURATELY, COMPLETELY, AND RELIABLY DEPICTED. IN ADDITION, IN SOME JURISDICTIONS, 813 OR OTHER SIMILAR UTILITY LOCATE REQUESTS FROM SURVEYORS MAY BE IGNORED OR RESULT IN AN INCOMPLETE RESPONSE, IN WHICH CASE THE SURVEYOR SHALL NOTE ON THE PLAT OR MAP HOW THIS AFFECTED THE SURVEYOR'S ASSESSMENT OF THE LOCATION OF THE UTILITIES. WHERE ADDITIONAL OR MORE DETAILED INFORMATION IS REQUIRED, THE CLIENT IS ADVISED THAT EXCAVATION AND/OR A PRIVATE UTILITY LOCATE REQUEST MAY BE NECESSARY.

ORDER NUMBER: 160326-R

SCALE: 1 INCH = 20 FEET

ORDERED BY: CCH LLC AN ILLINOIS LIMITED LIABILITY CO.

BUILDING LINES AND EASEMENTS, IF ANY, SHOWN HEREON ARE BUILDING LINES AND EASEMENTS AS SHOWN ON THE RECORDED SURVEYON IN PLAY. CONSENT LOCAL AUTHORITIES FOR BUILDING LINES ESTABLISHED BY LOCAL ORDINANCES.

PLEASE CHECK LEGAL DESCRIPTION WITH DEED.

COMPARE ALL POINTS BEFORE BUILDING AND REPORT ANY DISCREPANCY IMMEDIATELY.
DIMENSIONS ARE NOT TO BE ASSUMED FROM SCALING.

CERTIFICATION REVISED JANUARY 11, 2017

ALTA/NSPS LAND TITLE CERTIFICATE

STATE OF ILLINOIS

COUNTY OF COOK

HEREBY CERTIFIED TO: CCH LLC

CHICAGO TITLE INSURANCE COMPANY

THIS IS TO CERTIFY THAT THIS MAP OR PLAT AND THE SURVEY ON WHICH IT IS BASED WERE MADE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE 2016 MINIMUM STANDARD DETAIL REQUIREMENTS FOR ALTA/NSPS LAND TITLE SURVEYS, JOINTLY ESTABLISHED AND ADOPTED BY ALTA AND NSPS, AND INCLUDES ITEMS 1, 1.1, 3.4.4, AND 11 OF TABLE "A" THEREOF.

THE FIELD WORK WAS COMPLETED ON DECEMBER 16, 2016.

DATE OF PLAT OR MAP DECEMBER 20, 2016

ILLINOIS PROFESSIONAL LAND SURVEYOR NO. 2668
LICENSE EXPIRES NOVEMBER 30, 2014

Market Study –

Arlington 425 Development (Proposed Construction)

Multifamily Property

225 W. Campbell, 33 S. Chestnut, 44 S. Highland

Arlington Heights, Cook County, Illinois 60005

Prepared For:

CCH LLC

Effective Date of the Market Study:

August, 2018

IRR - Chicago

File Number: 194-2018-1167





Arlington 425 Development
225 W. Campbell, 33 S. Chestnut, and 44 S. Highland
Arlington Heights, Illinois



January 14, 2019

CCH LL
7458 N. Harlem Avenue
Chicago, IL 60631

SUBJECT: Market Study
 Arlington 425 Development (Proposed Construction)
 225 W. Campbell, 33 S. Chestnut, and 44 S. Highland
 Arlington Heights, Cook County, Illinois 60005
 IRR - Chicago File No. 194-2018-1167

Integra Realty Resources – Chicago is pleased to submit the accompanying market study of the referenced property as of August 2018. The market research was completed in August 2018 and has not been updated; however, the description of the proposed development has been updated to reflect the current design of the project.

Information for this report was researched and gathered from property inspections and conversations with brokers, developers, lenders, investors, managers, leasing agents, and sales agents involved in the Suburban Chicago apartment and condominium markets. On a quarterly basis since 2005, we have also researched the rental apartment market for Suburban Chicago. This ongoing work, along with our database going back 40+ years, well positions us to analyze and understand market trends specific to the proposed project.

Should you have any questions about this report or desire further consultations as you decide to move forward, please do not hesitate to call us directly. Thank you for the opportunity to be of service.

Respectfully submitted,

Integra Realty Resources - Chicago



Gail Lissner, SRA, CRE
Certified General Real Estate Appraiser
Illinois Certificate # 553.001842, exp. 9/30/2019
Telephone: 312-565-3423
Email: glissner@irr.com



Table of Contents

General Information	2	Lease-up Absorption Survey	110
Purpose of the Market Study	2	Condominium Competition Survey	112
Effective Date	3	Certification	129
Intended Use and User	3	Assumptions and Limiting Conditions	131
Sources of Data / Extent of Research	3	Addenda	
Applicable Requirements	3	A. Qualifications	
Report Format	3		
Prior Services	3		
Inspection	4		
Executive Summary and Conclusions	5		
Rental Analysis and Conclusions	7		
Condominium Analysis and Conclusions	19		
Maps and Architectural Drawings	25		
Suburban Chicago Apartment Market	41		
Summary of Rent, Occupancy & Concession			
Trends by Submarket	48		
Demand Generators	50		
Cook County – Northwest Apartment			
Submarket Overview	54		
Suburban Multi-Family Housing Supply	57		
Economic Analysis	65		
Chicago MSA Area Analysis	65		
Demographic Trends – 2018 Statistics	70		
Rental Competition Survey	76		
Existing Competition	76		
Future Competition	79		
Rental Competition Summary and Details	81		

General Information

Purpose of the Market Study

The purpose of this report is to provide:

- o ***Rental Apartment Market pertaining to the three proposed buildings:***
 - o Overview of the northwest Cook County rental apartment market.
 - o Analysis of the market demand for new rental apartment units at this location.
 - o Analysis of the projected renter profile.
 - o Survey and overview of the primary rental apartment competition in the market in terms of current and proposed inventory, unit sizes and mix, amenities and finishes, parking, rent trends, occupancy levels, and absorption rates.
 - o Critique regarding the proposed unit mix, unit sizes, unit finishes and project amenities for the proposed development.
 - o Conclusions regarding market rent levels and absorption projections for the proposed units. The rent levels will be projected in current dollars (August 2018) and at the time of projected occupancy.
- o ***Condominium Component pertaining to the Chestnut building which is being considered for condominium usage:***
 - o Overview of the condominium market pertinent to the subject location, including both new construction and resale product.
 - o Analysis of the market demand for new condominium units at this location.
 - o Analysis of the projected condominium buyer profile.
 - o Survey and overview of the primary condominium competition, including both new and resale product.
 - o Critique of the mix of unit types, unit sizes, unit finishes, and project amenities for the proposed building.
 - o Conclusions regarding the marketability of these units as condominiums.

Effective Date

The effective date of the analysis and conclusions is August 2018.

Intended Use and User

The addressee on the letter of transmittal is the client and the intended user of this report.

This report is prepared for exclusive use by the addressee for internal planning purposes.

Sources of Data / Extent of Research

An inspection of the subject site and neighborhood was completed along with a review of the architectural drawings which were provided for the subject property.

The following data sources were researched:

- Inspection of the site and a review of the architectural plans
- Visual inspection of the immediate neighborhood
- Ongoing discussions with brokers, developers, lenders and investors active in the suburban Chicago rental market and condominium market
- Inspection of the competing rental and condominium buildings in the market and discussions with management and leasing/sales agents
- Previous assignments where information was not confidential

The market research was completed in August 2018 and has not been updated; however, the description of the proposed development has been updated to reflect the current design of the project.

Applicable Requirements

This market study is intended to conform to the requirements of the following:

- Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice (USPAP);
- Code of Professional Ethics and Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice of the Appraisal Institute;

Report Format

This report is prepared under the Appraisal Report option of Standards Rule 2-2(a) of USPAP.

Prior Services

USPAP requires appraisers to disclose to the client any other services they have provided in connection with the subject property in the prior three years, including valuation, consulting, property management, brokerage, or any other services. We have not performed services, as an appraiser or in any other capacity, regarding the property that is the subject of this report within the three-year period immediately preceding acceptance of this assignment.

Inspection

Gail Lissner, SRA, CRE, conducted an inspection of the property in August, 2018.

Executive Summary and Conclusions



Architect's Rendering – Arlington 425

Location

The south side of W. Campbell between S. Highland Avenue and S. Chestnut Avenue with the specific addresses of 225 W. Campbell, 33 S. Chestnut and 44 S. Highland
Arlington Heights, Cook County, Illinois 60005

Concept

This vacant 3+ acre site is proposed for Arlington 425, a development with three residential buildings ranging in height from 4 to 12 stories. The buildings will range in size from 54 to 182 units, with a total of 361 units. The development plan, designed by Tinaglia Architects, is at an early stage of design and includes the following unit mix:

Proposed Unit Mix

	Studio	1BR	1BR+Den	2BR	2BR+Den	Total
HIGHLAND BUILDING						
SF Range	524-785	659- 1,088		1,035 - 1,170		
No. of Units	41	60		24		125
Total NRA SF	26,810	49,068		26,460		102,338
Avg Unit Size (SF)	654	818		1,103		819
Percentage	33%	48%		19%		100%
CHESTNUT BUILDING						
SF Range	515	815-827	976 - 1,162	899- 1,352	1,249-1,364	
No. of Units	4	12	8	22	8	54
Total NRA SF	2,060	9,888	8,063	26,937	10,452	57,400
Avg Unit Size (SF)	515	824	1,008	1,224	1,307	1,063
Percentage	7%	22%	15%	41%	15%	100%
CAMPBELL BUILDING						
SF Range	512-552	679- 853	974-990	914- 1,127		
No. of Units	42	77	21	42		182
Total NRA SF	22,428	59,094	20,601	42,203		144,326
Avg Unit Size (SF)	534	767	981	1005		793
Percentage	23%	42%	12%	23%		100%
TOTAL DEVELOPMENT						
SF Range	512-785	659-1,088	974-1,162	899-1,352	1,249-1,364	512-1,364
Total Units	87	149	29	88	8	361
Total NRA SF	51,298	118,050	28,664	95,600	10,452	304,064
Avg Unit Size (SF)	590	792	988	1,086	1,307	842
Percentage	24%	41%	8%	24%	2%	100%

Unit layouts have not yet been designed.

Conclusion

Based upon our analysis of the subject location, the proposed development plan, and the suburban rental apartment market, we believe that rental apartments will be marketable at this location.

We have provided rent projections based on the developer's proposed unit mix and unit sizes and concluded that net effective rents of approximately \$2.32 PSF should be achievable in 2018 dollars, along with garage parking at \$75 per space per month. Rents have been projected to increase at an annual rate of 2% until occupancy. The development of this project is currently planned to be phased. As a three-building development with individual buildings ranging in size from 54 units to 182 units, lease-up has been estimated at about 10 to 15 units per month.

Alternatively, we were also requested to critique the 33 South Chestnut building as a condominium. Overall, we believe that the subject property's strong location could support a condominium building. However, we suggest a building smaller in size (i.e. 25-35 units recommended) and with modifications

to the unit mix. The sales velocities being achieved in new developments both in the suburban market and in the city of Chicago are not supportive of such a large condominium development at the present time. Thus, until there is a strengthening in market demand, we believe that this building would be better suited to rental rather than condominium ownership.

Rental Analysis and Conclusions

Property Location

The subject property is located in Arlington Heights, a community of approximately 76,000 persons located northwest of O'Hare Airport in the northwest suburbs of Chicago. The location is 25 miles from Chicago's central business district ("The Loop") and 15 miles from O'Hare Airport. Specifically, the subject is located at the western end of the downtown core area and is bordered by single-family and vacant land on the west and south and commercial uses, a parking garage and mid-rise condominium buildings to the east and north. The village is bordered by Buffalo Grove on the north, Wheeling, Prospect Heights and Mount Prospect on the east, Elk Grove Village on the south and Rolling Meadows and Palatine on the west. Interstate 90 runs along portions of the southern border while Illinois Route 53 extends along portions of the western border. It is also served by the Metra Union Pacific/Northwest Line which has stops in downtown Arlington Heights and Arlington Park with train service to Ogilvie Transportation Center. The downtown Arlington Heights Metra station is within a very short walk from the subject site.

Overall, the subject property's location in downtown Arlington Heights is considered to be excellent. It is located on the south side of the train tracks which divides the downtown area; the subject property's neighborhood is where the majority of the retail and restaurant development has taken place in downtown Arlington Heights. With its vibrant streetscape, numerous restaurants with outdoor seating, and a good mix of retail tenants, downtown Arlington Heights is considered to be one of the most desirable downtowns in the north/northwest suburban market.

The 2018 average household income in a five mile radius of the subject property is estimated at \$87,102 according to Environics Analytics. Within the past 12 months, according to MRED LLC, 790 detached single-family homes in Arlington Heights sold at prices averaging \$416,156, with a median house price of \$372,000. Home sales ranged between \$132,000 and \$1,400,000. 503 condominium and townhome units also sold, with an average price of \$188,234 and a median price of \$156,000. Prices ranged between \$70,000 and \$745,000.

Unlike other areas in the suburban metropolitan area, there has been very limited large-scale rental apartment development in the Northwest suburbs and specifically in Arlington Heights. The lack of newer product has been more a function of the lack of the availability of sites suitable for development rather than the submarket economics. The only recent large-scale apartment project to date in Arlington Heights is One Arlington, a 214 unit adaptive reuse project which was completed in 2014. This project is situated west of Arlington Park. In 2018 the Parkview Apartment project, a 45-unit building, was built in the downtown area at the southwest corner of Dunton Avenue and Eastman. This project consists of a mix of one, two, and three bedroom units, including an affordable component. In July 2018, a 76-unit proposed apartment building at the northwest corner of Kensington and Hickory was approved for development. This site is located outside of downtown Arlington Heights but close to other retail including a Mariano's grocery. However, it lacks the subject

property's downtown ambience and other amenities. In addition, the phase II of the Arlington Downs development is also planned for development in 2019, adding another 263 Class A rental apartment units to Arlington Heights. However, neither of these properties will have a downtown Arlington Heights location.

Northwest Cook County Suburban Rental Market Conditions


The Cook County Northwest submarket is defined as roughly Interstate 294 to the east, Lake County on the north, Route 59 on the west and DuPage County to the south. O'Hare International Airport is at the southeastern most part of the submarket. Cook County Northwest was one of the first submarkets to develop to a significant density in the suburban Chicago market area. The Integra Realty Resources - Chicago internal database for the Cook County Northwest submarket consists of 25,711 dwelling units which are tracked on a quarterly basis. The median unit size for the submarket is 877 square feet which is in-line with the overall suburban market. The median year built was 1975 compared to the overall suburban market having a median of 1986.

Cook County Northwest was one of the first submarkets to be develop in suburban Chicago to a significant density. However, no new apartment development took place in the 1990s or early 2000s. It was not until 60 units were constructed in Des Plaines in 2011 that there was any new rental product added to this submarket since the 1980s, and these 60 units actually began construction as condominiums but were completed as rental apartments during the downturn in the for-sale market. There have only been a few new projects added to this rather sizable market during the past few years, but development activity has increased with over 1,000 units currently under construction for delivery in 2018/2019. The lack of newer product in the Northwest Cook County submarket has been more a function of lack of sites suitable for development rather than submarket economics.

As shown on the following page, new rental apartment development did not occur in the Northwest Cook County submarket for many years and has only begun occurring in the past few years.

New Construction Apt Units Delivered in NW Cook Submarket: 1996-1997 and Under Construction for Delivery in 2018/2019

(c) 2018 Integra Realty Resources - Chicago



Median net rent per square foot as of 2Q 2018 stands at \$1.52, a gain of 1.4 percent from a year ago. Rents in the Northwest Cook submarket are up 1.8 percent compared to the levels posted two years ago. One-bedrooms have a median rent of \$1,200 while two bedrooms have a median net rent of \$1,422. Occupancy is down 70 bps from 95.2 percent one year ago to the current level of 94.5 percent. The submarket remains relatively “full” with pricing therefore expected to remain stable.

Renter Profile

The subject’s location within downtown Arlington Heights will be appealing to persons with or without use of a car due to the abundance of restaurants, shops, and a grocery store within walking distance. The Metra station is also within walking distance. Thus, the location will appeal a wide variety of persons who are attracted to the urban/suburban nature of its location. Specifically, elderly empty nesters without a car will find this to be a very attractive location and younger, more mobile empty nesters who would want a walkable suburban downtown location will find this to be an excellent choice when down-sizing from a detached or townhouse residence in the area.

It is anticipated that the renter profile will also be comprised of persons who work in the area, commute via train or I-90, I-290, or I-294 or couples who work in different parts of the metropolitan area and require a location which is centralized for their individual commutes. With the proximity to the O’Hare and Schaumburg office markets along with a multitude of other employment opportunities available via the highway network, this is a rather central location for a person working in the northwest suburban market.

We also view the demand for this location to be generated by persons who have a connection to Arlington Heights. It is a location which could also appeal to persons in transition – i.e. moving locally

or transferees, persons in the process of obtaining a divorce, divorced parents wishing to remain close to their families in the Arlington Heights area, or active grandparents relocating to be closer to their adult children and grandchildren and desiring a new construction rental apartment. Thus, the property is expected to appeal to a rather wide renter profile.

Competition Overview

The subject will compete with other rental apartment developments also located within the Northwest Cook submarket and more specifically those located within Arlington Heights and the surrounding communities. While the survey focused on properties located in adjoining suburbs, we also placed particular weight on properties which offer a similar type of downtown location. At the present time, this is not available in many northwest suburbs, but apartment buildings have been developed in downtown locations in Glenview, Des Plaines, and Park Ridge with one under construction currently in Mt Prospect.

Sixteen large apartment properties comprising of 3,588 units were identified as providing potential competition to the subject units, either as primary or secondary competition. Of the 16 properties, two are older buildings which have been renovated and are located within downtown Arlington Heights and one is a newly developed property located close to Arlington Park, in the western section of Arlington Heights.





A summary of the data is presented on the following pages.

Apartment Rental Competition Overview


© 2018 Integra Realty Resources - Chicago, All Rights Reserved

Name	Address	Suburb	Total Units	Class	Date Built	Avg Size (SF)	Quoted Rent PSF	Net Rent PSF	Garage Fee	Occup.
Subject - Campbell		Arlington Heights	182	A	Proposed	793				
Subject - Highland		Arlington Heights	125	A	Proposed	819				
Subject - Chestnut		Arlington Heights	54	A	Proposed	1,063				
Subject - Total			361			842				
Dunton Tower	55 South Vail	Arlington Heights	216	B	1986	902	\$1.92	\$1.92	\$75	98.1%
Hancock Square	200 North Arlington Hts Rd	Arlington Heights	409	B	1988	849	\$2.34	\$2.34	\$75	96.3%
One Arlington	3400 W. Stonegate Blvd	Arlington Heights	214	A	2014	936	\$2.08	\$2.08	\$75	93.9%
North680	680 E. Algonquin Rd.	Schaumburg	180	A	2017	894	\$2.21	\$2.21	\$75 - \$120	87.8%
Buckingham Place	750 E. Northwest Hwy	Des Plaines	267	A	2018	961	\$1.94	\$1.84	\$75	In lease up
River 595	595 S. River Rd	Des Plaines	60	A	2011	1,397	\$1.63	\$1.51	\$100	93.3%
Kingston Pointe	1646 River St	Des Plaines	144	A	2009	1,203	\$1.79	\$1.79	\$50 - \$100	91.7%
Tapestry Glenview	2550 Waterview Dr	Glenview	290	A	2014	887	\$2.18	\$2.09	\$60	99.0%
Aloft at Glen Town Center	1991 Tower Drive	Glenview	181	A	2004	1,141	\$2.05	\$1.88	\$75 - \$125	89.5%
Midtown Square	998 Church St	Glenview	138	A	2014	920	\$2.40	\$2.25	\$135	94.9%
Reserve at Glenview	195 N. Waukegan Rd	Glenview	239	A	2015	1,013	\$2.28	\$2.19	\$75 - \$125	89.5%
Northgate Crossing	250 Northgate Pkwy	Wheeling	300	A	2016	969	\$1.83	\$1.62	\$145 - \$175	87.7%
Park 205	205 W. Touhy	Park Ridge	115	A	2015	975	\$2.49	\$2.49	\$125 - \$200	96.5%
The Res. At Hamilton Lakes	1133 N. Arlington Heights	Itasca	297	A	2015	934	\$2.24	\$2.21	\$125	In lease up
444 Social	444 Parkway Drive	Lincolnshire	302	A	2018	953	\$2.42	\$2.12	\$75 - \$150	In lease up
Deer Park Crossing	21599 W. Field Ct.	Deer Park	236	A	2018	1,350	\$1.98	\$1.70	\$150	In lease up
Total			3,588							

Market Survey Summary



In comparing the average rents per square foot and average unit sizes, the range of data for these 16 properties is shown below:



Subject projections shown in red

The Subject Property - Unit Mix

We have been provided with the unit mix and the unit sizes for the subject property but the individual unit layouts were not available. Thus, we were not able to refine our conclusions relative to the functional appeal of the individual unit layouts.

The current mix of units is proposed by the developer as follows:

Developer Unit Mix and Unit Sizes

	Studio	1BR	1BR+Den	2BR	2BR+Den	Total
HIGHLAND BUILDING						
SF Range	524-785	659- 1,088		1,035 - 1,170		
No. of Units	41	60		24		125
Total NRA SF	26,810	49,068		26,460		102,338
Avg Unit Size (SF)	654	818		1,103		819
Percentage	33%	48%		19%		100%
CHESTNUT BUILDING						
SF Range	515	815-827	976 - 1,162	899- 1,352	1,249-1,364	
No. of Units	4	12	8	22	8	54
Total NRA SF	2,060	9,888	8,063	26,937	10,452	57,400
Avg Unit Size (SF)	515	824	1,008	1,224	1,307	1,063
Percentage	7%	22%	15%	41%	15%	100%
CAMPBELL BUILDING						
SF Range	512-552	679- 853	974-990	914- 1,127		
No. of Units	42	77	21	42		182
Total NRA SF	22,428	59,094	20,601	42,203		144,326
Avg Unit Size (SF)	534	767	981	1005		793
Percentage	23%	42%	12%	23%		100%
TOTAL DEVELOPMENT						
SF Range	512-785	659-1,088	974-1,162	899-1,352	1,249-1,364	512-1,364
Total Units	87	149	29	88	8	361
Total NRA SF	51,298	118,050	28,664	95,600	10,452	304,064
Avg Unit Size (SF)	590	792	988	1,086	1,307	842
Percentage	24%	41%	8%	24%	2%	100%

Based upon our review of the inventory in the market and how each building is performing, we conclude that the overall average unit size is marketable and oriented towards the demand in the market. However, since the unit layouts are not yet drawn, we cannot opine further on the functionality or marketability of the individual layouts. While the overall unit size is in line with the market, some of the individual units are oversized and may exhibit potential for some refinement.

Studio Units: The development will contain 87 studio units ranging in size from 512 to 785 SF. Thus, the studios comprise 24% of the total units in the development. This is a very large percentage of studio units for a development in the suburbs although it is consistent with the unit mix at One Arlington where studio units have been in strong demand. The studio units in the Campbell and Chestnut buildings fall at the lower end of the range from 512 to 552 SF, while the Highland building has a mix of studio unit sizes ranging from 524 to 785 SF. Based upon our conversations with leasing agents, it is clear that there is strong demand for new construction studio units in the suburban market. Typically, the newer buildings in the suburban market offer convertible units with a separate sleeping alcove. Because the floor plans for the subject units have not been developed or provided, we are not able to determine whether these studio units will have an alcove area. In addition, studio

units typically are not larger than 600 SF; thus, the studio units in the Highland building which become as large as 785 SF will be very oversized for the market. If these units can function as one bedroom units, they will be marketable. If they function only as studio units, their rents will be impacted on a rent per square foot basis. With few existing developments offering studio units and given the subject property's downtown location, this will be an excellent product type for inclusion in the project.

One Bedroom Units: The 149 one bedroom units (41% of the total units in the project) will range from 659 to 1,088 SF. The unit sizes in the Campbell and Chestnut buildings will range from 679 to 853 SF while the Highland building has some very oversized one bedroom units ranging as large as 1,088 SF. With such large sizes, these units will be marketable to renters but will not be able to maximize the rent on a per square foot basis for the owner. If these oversized one bedroom units are able to function as a one bedroom plus den unit, that will be beneficial.

One Bedroom Plus Den Units: Eight percent of the units in the development will be one bedroom plus den units, for a total of 29 units. Unit sizes range from 974 to 1,162 SF. The bulk of the one bedroom plus den units are located in the Campbell building and are under 1,000 SF while there are some oversized units in the Chestnut building. More typically, one bedroom plus den units should provide a bridge between one bedroom and two bedroom units; thus, their sizes should fall below the typical two bedroom sizes. When oversized and priced like two bedroom units, the market generally resists these units and they tend to lease more slowly and at rents below the market averages.

Two Bedroom Units: The property will contain a wide range of two bedroom unit sizes, ranging in size from 899 to 1,352 SF and comprising 24% of the units in the development. This is an extremely wide range and will provide diverse choices for the renters. However, we do note that when units are particularly large, it is difficult for ownership to maximize rent on a per square foot basis.

Two Bedroom plus Den Units: Rather than providing three bedroom units, the Chestnut building will have eight two bedroom plus den units, comprising 2% of the total units. These units will range in size from 1,249 to 1,364 SF and will be similar to the large two bedroom units in terms of overall size. We assume that these layouts will be versatile and that these units can function as three bedroom units, if desired by the resident.

Subject Property - Unit Finishes and Building Amenities

A list of unit finishes was not provided with this assignment. We assume that the unit finishes will be consistent with the new construction competition in the suburban market and will meet the expectation of tenants seeking modern homes with the latest design and features.

- Unit finishes should include 9' ceiling heights, full-size washer/dryer, walk-in closets, balconies, and window treatments (roller blinds). The market has moved away from carpeting and instead is using vinyl plank flooring (engineered hardwood used occasionally and only in higher end properties). Kitchens should be equipped with attractive cabinets, granite or quarter counters, full-height backsplash, and good quality stainless steel appliances. Gas cooktops are preferred in the market rather than electric.
- Currently, the subject property consists of three buildings and it appears that there will be some sharing of amenities. With a project this size, there is the opportunity to provide

amenities which are superior to the other rental alternatives in the Arlington Heights market. If the amenities are not shared, they will need to be more limited and scaled back.

- For a 361 unit development, we suggest that the following:
 - Fitness center with separate yoga or multi-purpose room
 - Residential lounge areas/clubrooms with places to socialize, areas with big screen TVs, informal co-working areas, conference rooms, and coffee bar. With the increasing number of people who work from home either on a full-time or occasional basis, it is important to provide informal areas which cater to their needs, including a few small conference rooms for meetings. We are seeing some developers omit formal business centers as much since the residents will typically own computers; however, residents frequently do not own a printer and when provided by a building, these are well used. A separate club room which can also be rented for private parties is also popular.
 - Wi-fi in all public areas
 - Rooftop sun decks with barbecue areas, dining areas, and seating areas. These types of spaces have become very resort-like in many developments and are not merely open decks with tables and chairs. When accessed from the residential lounge/club room areas, the market appeal of both the club area and the roof deck is enhanced.
 - Pets have become extremely important, leading to an increase in the number of dogs in rental apartment buildings. A pet spa (area to wash and groom a pet) and a partially covered dog walk area (particularly useful on bad weather days) are popular amenities.
 - With people shopping extensively on line, it is becoming very challenging for buildings to handle packages. There are package rooms and package systems such as Luxor and Amazon which can be utilized, as the number of package deliveries continues to grow. Thus, it is very important to design the building to efficiently accommodate the increasing number of packages that residents receive.
 - Bike storage areas
 - Individual storage lockers will also be important, particularly if the property caters to empty nesters. These can be leased for an additional monthly fee, depending upon the size of the locker. Typically, these spaces rent for \$25 to \$50 per month.
 - With 361 units, we would also suggest an outdoor swimming pool. Discussions with leasing agents confirm the desirability of this amenity and its importance in the leasing of the units.

The Subject Property - Parking Amenity

The subject property is being planned with a parking ratio of approximately 1.5:1. However, the location of the spaces is unusual in that the Campbell building will not have any parking spaces, with spaces in the Chestnut and Highland buildings. This will result in a bridge connecting the parking garage structure in the Highland building to the Campbell building. While bridges are less than ideal as they can result in longer walks and an additional elevator ride for the residents, they are rather common in downtown Arlington Heights where both Dunton and Hancock have bridges connecting to parking garages.


Given its downtown Arlington Heights location in close proximity to shopping, restaurants, and the Metra, we expect that parking demand will be more limited than in a non-downtown Arlington Heights location. In addition, with the anticipation that older empty nesters could be attracted to the development, this could also lessen demand. We have estimated a monthly parking fee of \$75 per month in current dollars which is consistent with other buildings in the downtown Arlington Heights market.

The Subject Property - Recommended Rents (average)

Based upon an analysis of the subject location and overall development scheme, we believe that rental apartment units will be marketable at this location. Assuming that the property will have well designed, functional unit layouts and high-end amenities and finishes which are comparable to the luxury, Class A new construction competition in the market, we have estimated general rent ranges for the units as follows:

Projected Rents (2018 dollars)

	Studio	1BR	1BR+Den	2BR	2BR+Den	Total
TOTAL DEVELOPMENT						
SF Range	512-785	659-1,088	974-1,162	899-1,352	1,249-1,364	512-1,364
Total Units	87	149	29	88	8	361
Total NRA SF	51,298	118,050	28,664	95,600	10,452	304,064
Avg Unit Size (SF)	590	792	988	1,086	1,307	842
Percentage	24%	41%	8%	24%	2%	100%
Est. Rent	\$1,550	\$1,850	\$2,150	\$2,400	\$2,600	
PSF	\$2.63	\$2.34	\$2.18	\$2.21	\$1.99	\$2.32



With the developer's unit mix, we have concluded that a net effective rent of \$2.32 PSF should be achievable in current dollars, with parking at \$75/space/month. We expect that rents will increase and have estimated an annual rate of about 2% per year.

The Subject Property - Estimated Absorption

As is typical of lease-up programs, lease-up can occur with a large spurt of activity at the beginning of the program, particularly if it is timed for the spring and summer leasing season, with the pace slowing as the program continues. In the Chicago MSA market, very little leasing activity takes place between November and February and the bulk of this winter activity is generated by need-based moves. In fact, most owners do not like to have leases come due during this winter period due to the lack of potential renter traffic at this time of year.

The subject units will be facing increasing competition in the overall market area as there are several projects which are under construction in communities such as Mount Prospect, Des Plaines, and Wheeling. While these downtowns may lack the cache of Arlington Heights, they are still considered to be potential alternatives. In addition, there is a growing pipeline of proposed projects which have not yet broken ground but which are in varying stages of the entitlement, design, and financing process. Thus, we expect that the market will be more competitive when the subject buildings begin offering units for occupancy.

Integra Realty Resources – Chicago has been surveying the lease-up pace in all of the new suburban apartment projects in the Chicago MSA. The detailed information is shown later in this report. Overall, since 2013, projects have been leasing up an average pace of 12 units per month. Overall, we are projecting a similar lease-up pace of approximately 10 to 15 units per month, assuming a phased lease-up.

Condominium Analysis and Conclusions

We have also been requested to explore the condominium potential for the 33 South Chestnut building as this building may instead be developed as a condominium rather than as a rental apartment building. The other two buildings are being planned for rental utilization.

As a first step, a survey of the condominium market was undertaken. The condominium competition survey is comprised of two components:

Resale product – existing condominium units in mid-rise and high-rise condominium building located in downtown Arlington Heights that were developed within the past 20 year. This survey provides current pricing for the alternatives currently existing in the downtown Arlington Heights market.

New product – proposed or newly constructed condominium buildings located in the suburbs in the Chicago Metropolitan Area, with a focus on locations in suburban downtowns. This survey provides insights into the types of units being developed in suburban downtowns throughout the MSA, the pricing of these units, and the sales absorption pace being achieved.

Condominium development halted abruptly 10 years ago with the market downturn. Projects which had been engaged in marketing at that time were either aborted (if pre-construction) or eventually finished if already under construction. Some of the buildings such as River 595 and Kingston Pointe in downtown Des Plaines were converted to rental utilization and are still operating as rental apartment buildings at the present time. Other buildings, such as the 119-unit Hamptons of Hinsdale townhome and condo project, were completed after sellout programs that lasted much longer than originally envisioned. In fact, the Hamptons of Hinsdale project was finally completed and sold out in 2017, 10 years after its marketing program had originally started.

Townhouse development has again been occurring throughout the Chicago MSA with several local and national builders actively and successfully developing townhouse projects. This is occurring in a wide variety of markets throughout the region. As townhomes frequently cater to a first-time buyer with product in the mid \$300,000 range and can be built in phases as units sell, this has been a popular for-sale product for both buyers and developers. Townhomes also don't require the long lead times that condominium buildings do, with the buyers being able to complete their sale without the delays that can occur with condominium development. Pre-sale requirements are not an issue in townhouse development similar to a large condominium building where it can take a developer one or two years to gather enough sales to break ground. Thus, the townhouse development has led the recovery, with condominium development still occurring on an extremely limited and sporadic basis.

On the following page is a summary of the resale pricing in downtown Arlington Heights along with a review of recent condominium development activity in the suburbs of Chicago. Geographically, the new condominium development is spread out across DuPage, Cook, Lake, and Kane Counties. None of this development activity has been occurring in the Northwest Cook submarket or on the North Shore, with the exception of Lake Forest. Even Evanston which had been such an active new

development condo market in the early 2000s and is currently undergoing extensive rental development currently has not experienced new condominium development in recent years. In addition, Naperville is a market where condominium development would have been expected given its highly popular and successful downtown district. While the 13 acres surrounding the Naperville Metra station are being planned by the Ryan Companies as a mixed-use development, the entitlement process has been lengthy and the plans for the residential component of the project have not been finalized. Thus, no new condominium product has been added to the Naperville market either.

The list of recent and proposed condominium projects in the suburban market is a rather short list as summarized below along with the resale activity in downtown Arlington Heights

Condominium Survey Overview

New Development Activity in the Suburban Chicago MSA and 2017/2018 Resales in Downtown Arlington Heights

Name of Development	Address	City	Type	Mktg Start	Year Delivered	Total # of Units	Units Sold	% Sold	# Mos. Mktg	Avg Price PSF
New Construction Condominiums Engaged in Marketing										
The Residences at Ashland	40 S. Ashland Ave	La Grange	New Construction	Oct-14	2017	17	14	82%	46	\$323
Marquis on Maple	940 Maple Ave	Downers Grove	New Construction	Jan-16	2017	55	20	36%	32	\$292
Kelmscott Park	1155 Kelmscott Way	Lake Forest	New Construction	Jul-16	2019	24	9	38%	25	\$415
District House	147 N. Euclid Ave	Oak Park	New Construction	Aug-16	2018	28	27	96%	24	\$414
Sterling Condos	10 W. Illinois St.	St. Charles	New Construction	Jan-17	2018	13	12	92%	18	\$178 shell
1101 Bonnie Brae	1101 Bonnie Brae	River Forest	New Construction	Early 2017	Proposed	15	0	0%	18	\$423
Foxford Station	4441 Wolf Road	Western Springs	New Construction	Mar-17	2019	28	9	32%	17	\$346
The Hill	105 S. Cottage Hill Ave.	Elmhurst	New Construction	Jun-18	Proposed	23	0	0%	2	\$424
One95 Elmhurst	195 N. Addison	Elmhurst	New Construction	Aug-18	Proposed	20		0%	n/a	n/a
New Construction Condominium Pipeline										
RF	Lake & Lathrop	River Forest	New Construction	TBD	Proposed	30				
One Winnetka	Elm and Lincoln	Winnetka	New Construction	TBD	Proposed	22				
The Butler	1900 Spring Road	Oak Brook	New Construction	TBD	Proposed	90				
Downtown Arlington Heights Resale Competition										
200 W. Campbell	200 W. Campbell	Arlington Hts	Resales		2000	91	91	100%		\$215
Metrolofts	10 S. Dunton	Arlington Hts	Resales		2007	55	55	100%		\$237
The Evergreen	77 S. Evergreen	Arlington Hts	Resales		2000	94	94	100%		\$207
Metropolis Place	1 S. Highland	Arlington Hts	Resales		2001	63	63	100%		\$208
44 N. Vail	44 N. Vail	Arlington Hts	Resales		2000	80	80	100%		\$230
201 N. Vail	201 N. Vail	Arlington Hts	Resales		1995	61	61	100%		\$178
Wing Street Residences	151 W. Wing	Arlington Hts	Resales		2003	61	61	100%		\$264

Condominium Survey Unit Sales Prices

New Development Activity in the Suburban Chicago MSA and 2017/2018 Resales in Downtown Arlington Heights

		One Bedroom			2BR/2BR+Den Range			Three Bedroom Range		
Name of Development	City	Price Range	SF Range	Price PSF Range	Price Range	SF Range	Price PSF Range	Price Range	SF Range	Price PSF Range
New Construction Condominiums Engaged in Marketing										
The Residences at Ashland	La Grange							\$839,000-\$869,000	2,650	\$317-\$328
Marquis on Maple	Downers Grove				\$330,000-\$425,000	1,205-1,498	\$274-\$284	\$500,000-\$565,000	1,715-1,884	\$292-\$300
Kelmscott Park	Lake Forest				\$650,000-\$735,000	1,528-1,772	\$415-\$425	\$825,000-\$975,000	1,967-2,565	\$380-\$419
District House	Oak Park							\$559,900-\$972,950	1,700-2,056	\$329-\$473
Sterling Condos	St. Charles									
1101 Bonnie Brae	River Forest							\$799,900-\$1,070,000	1,900-2,550	\$419-\$421
Foxford Station	Western Springs				\$599,000-\$739,000	1,770-2.115	\$338-\$349	\$664,000-\$1,099,000	1,978-3,034	\$336-\$362
The Hill	Elmhurst				\$579,900-\$689,900	1,352-1,418	\$429-\$487	\$699,900-\$839,900	1,968	\$356-\$427
One95 Elmhurst	Elmhurst							\$799,900-\$1,100,000		
New Construction Condominium Pipeline										
RF	River Forest									
One Winnetka	Winnetka									
The Butler	Oak Brook									
Downtown Arlington Heights Resale Competition										
200 W. Campbell	Arlington Hts	\$227,500	1,216	\$187	\$325,000-\$340,000	1,431-1,628	\$203-233			
Metrolofts	Arlington Hts	\$183,000-\$257,000	964-1,063	\$190-\$242	\$270,000-\$305,000	1,265	\$213-\$233			
The Evergreen	Arlington Hts				\$280,500-\$425,000	1,591-1,800	\$176-\$236	\$595,000	3,100	\$192
Metropolis Place	Arlington Hts	\$218,000-\$225,000	1,000	\$225	\$279,995-\$330,000	1,388-1,500	\$202-\$220			
44 N. Vail	Arlington Hts	\$240,000-\$332,000	1,130-1,333	\$212-\$249	\$452,500-\$555,000	2,076-2,164	\$218-\$237			
201 N. Vail	Arlington Hts	\$160,000	1,000	\$160	\$272,000-\$355,000	1,703-1,850	\$160-\$192			
Wing Street Residences	Arlington Hts	\$248,000-\$270,000	975-1,100	\$225-\$277	\$465,000-\$745,000	1,700-3,100	\$240-\$274			

Conclusions regarding the condominium potential of the 33 South Chestnut Building

Building Overview

The Chestnut building will include the following:

Chestnut Building Unit Mix

	Studio	1BR	1BR+Den	2BR	2BR+Den	Total
CHESTNUT BUILDING						
SF Range	515	815-827	976 - 1,162	899- 1,352	1,249-1,364	
No. of Units	4	12	8	22	8	54
Total NRA SF	2,060	9,888	8,063	26,937	10,452	57,400
Avg Unit Size (SF)	515	824	1,008	1,224	1,307	1,063
Percentage	7%	22%	15%	41%	15%	100%

As a condominium, a challenge will be its size with 54 units. The new construction condominium market is only in the initial stages of recovery since the recession 10 years ago. All of the new development taking place is modest in size in order to limit development risk. Smaller project sizes can reduce the time period needed to meet a lender's presale requirement and the time it will take to achieve a sellout of the project.

Rather than the proposed 54 units in the Chestnut building, if this were a 25 to 35 unit project, it could have the potential to be successful. However, with the current sales pace in the market, a condominium development of this size would be quite challenging. Even in the downtown Chicago market where there is more robust demand for housing, most of the developments are significantly smaller than 54 units and the sales absorption in the overall condo market still remains at a very modest pace.

Currently, studio units are not popular in the condominium market and would not be a recommended product type. This could be resolved by combining with the adjoining unit. The building also has a large component of one bedroom and one bedroom plus den units, comprising 37% of the units. These units will be less marketable as luxury condominium units since buyers of "smaller" units tend to be more price sensitive and may gravitate to the resale product in the market. Thus, it is difficult to design a building for either condominium or rental utilization as these are two distinct segments of the market with different preferences in terms of unit sizes.

Buyer Profile

Condominium buildings typically attract a broad range of buyers including first time buyers, move-up buyers, and move-down/empty nester buyers. Its location in downtown Arlington Heights will attract younger singles and couples who are employed in the northwest suburban market and desire a more urban/suburban experience than provided at the typical garden style or elevator complexes in the area. This location will also be very marketable to empty nester couples and single persons/widowed who will be attracted to the variety of amenities offered downtown. Proximity to the Metra will also

attract some buyers who either plan a daily commute downtown or like the convenience of being near the train for occasional use. Also, as residents age in place, this location would be very convenient as they would be less dependent upon a car for their daily activities.

The target market of buyers will also include divorced parents who want to stay close to their families who are living in Arlington Heights or a neighboring suburb along with grandparents who are relocating to be close to their grandchildren.


As new construction units, the subject property will need to attract buyers who are not price sensitive, while still staying in line with overall housing values in the Arlington Heights market. The target market of buyers for the subject units will have lower priced alternatives in the existing condominium buildings in downtown Arlington Heights. However, these buyers will need to be enticed to pay a price premium over the existing product by providing layouts, amenities, and finishes at the subject property which are superior to the existing resale product.

Conclusion


As shown by the survey of pricing in downtown Arlington Heights, the resale product in the market is selling at prices in the low to mid \$200s PSF. However, these units are 15 to 20 years old and the properties lack the amenities and up-to-date finishes found in new construction properties. The recent and new construction condominium developments in the suburban market have been targeted towards the more affluent empty nester buyers by providing large unit sizes. Most of these developments have been priced in the low \$400s PSF for properties in the higher priced suburbs, with the low end of the range being close to the \$300-\$350 PSF range. None of the new suburban condominium projects have included one bedroom units, instead focusing primarily on the three bedroom units, with a smaller number of two bedroom units. Similarly, in the Downtown Chicago and Lincoln Park submarkets, developers are currently not providing one bedroom units because these units tend to be purchased by more price-sensitive buyers. One building in Lincoln Park was designed with one bedroom units as 29% of its mix and has combined some of these units due lack of demand by buyers willing to pay the premiums required by new construction.

Overall, we believe that the subject property's strong location could support a condominium building. However, we suggest a building smaller in size than the 54 units which are currently proposed. Thus, as a 54 unit development, we believe that it will be better suited to rental rather than condominium ownership at the present time.


Surrounding Area Map



Location Map



Aerial View of Site





View north towards subject site from Sigwalt
(Photos Taken in August 2018)



View south at subject from Chestnut and Campbell



View of the south elevation of the public garage which
abuts subject on the east



View south on Highland towards Metropolis Place Condos
and public garage



View east of subject along Campbell towards condo
buildings



View southeast from Campbell and Chestnut towards
subject site



Campbell Building - rendering



Campbell and Chestnut Buildings - rendering



Highland Building - rendering



Highland Building - rendering




Rooftop view of the three buildings - rendering



View of the three buildings - rendering


Site Plan




Arlington 425 Development (Proposed Construction)




44 South Highland Floor Plans




Campbell Building Floor Plans



Campbell Building Rear Elevation



Chestnut Building Floor Plans




Arlington 425 Development (Proposed Construction)



Suburban Chicago Apartment Market

Market area defined. The Suburban Chicago market is defined as including Cook, Lake, McHenry, Kane, Kendall, DuPage and Will counties. Properties located within the city of Chicago are of course excluded from the survey.




Survey property profile. The database for the Suburban Chicago survey includes 300+ complexes with a total of just under 100,000 dwelling units indicating an average development size of just over 300 units. Our survey includes virtually every major apartment community developed since 1995 plus older developments (primarily post-1970) throughout the MSA. The data was gathered by direct contact with on-site staff and/or ownership.

Rent Trends & Concessions. Median net rent per square foot is at \$1.47 which is up 1.2 percent from a year ago and accompanied by a rise in occupancy. One bedroom units have a median net rent of \$1,229 per month while two bedrooms are at \$1,433. Compared to two years ago, net rent growth has amounted to a positive 4.5 percent. We expect rent growth to be flat in the near term due to the softening job market, particularly in the suburbs.

Concessions are a marketing tool used to react to current demand without the need for continually adjusting “market” rents. The percent of complexes offering concessions is roughly 25 which is fairly steady to slightly rising over the last several quarters. The amount of the concession, currently offered at just under one month per lease year, has been relatively flat. Concessions are expected to remain in the market over the next year.

Occupancy. Physical occupancy is at 95.6 percent for the entire market – up 20 bps from a year ago but down 150 bps from two years ago. At 95+ percent occupancy, the suburban market overall is considered “full” indicating pricing has the potential to rise but is mitigated by the weakening job market. We expect occupancy to remain steady in the near term.

Market Revenue Performance. Market revenue performance is a function of the product of net rent and occupancy.



Market revenue performance for the overall suburban market remains strong. The modest downward trends in the last quarters of the year are seasonal.

New construction/Communities in Lease-up.

There are a number of projects under construction throughout the MSA. Details are presented in the Housing Supply section.


Several of the projects we are tracking are mid-rise buildings on in-fill sites rather than traditional walk up complexes. These have been favored in redeveloping downtown areas where transit-oriented development is needed but the all-in costs of construction at over \$300 per square foot or \$300,000+ per unit (wrap product) require fairly high rent levels for project feasibility. Walk up product cost is in the \$125,000-\$135,000 per unit range (not including soft costs or land).

In response to the inability to add new product to the market, owners are undertaking renovation projects in order to capitalize on demand for higher end product. Renovations often include replacing cabinetry, counters, fixtures and floor coverings.

All Suburban Apartments - 2q18

Showing median trend lines

Net Rent PSF - \$1.47




Snapshot & Trends


Suburban Metro

Complexes	327	
Units	98,560	
SF/unit	909	
Yr Built	1986	
Net PSF	\$1.47	→
Occupancy	95.6%	→
Pct W/concessions	29.1%	→
Concession Amt	7.7%	→
One Bdrm/Mo	\$1,229	↗
Two Bdrm/Mo	\$1,433	→


Occupancy - 95.6%




Net One Bdrm - \$1,229/mo



Concessions - 7.7% when offered



Net Two Bdrm - \$1,433/mo




Performance by Property Class

The suburban survey dataset includes has the following characteristics:

	Class A	Class B	Class C
Distribution (units)	26%	35%	39%
Median Year Built	2009	1987	1972
Median Unit Size (sf)	979	882	839
Average Complex Size	252	341	311


Property Classes are generally defined as follow:

- Class A - Newer properties that have generally been constructed since the early 1990s. Amenities often include open layout floor plans, 9-foot ceilings, in-unit washer and dryer, high quality cabinetry and potentially granite counters and stainless-steel appliances. Some communities have direct entry garages. The complex typically has a clubhouse, fitness center and swimming pool.
- Class B - Typically constructed in the 1980s but may include older product that has been significantly renovated. Amenities often include open layout floor plans, 8-foot ceilings, in-unit washer and dryer, good quality cabinetry and laminate counters. The complex typically has a clubhouse, fitness center and swimming pool.
- Class C - Typically constructed in the 1970s with limited renovations, if any. Units typically have older style floor plans (such as galley style, closed kitchens), average quality cabinetry and laminate counters. The complex may have a clubhouse and swimming pool but the quality is generally average. Laundry facilities are typically limited to a laundry room in the complex.




There was a clear bifurcation in performance by property class in 2010 with gains in net rent achieved primarily in the Class A and B markets while Class C properties lagged. The Class C market turned in 2011 with product gaining momentum primarily due to the rising cost of A and B product. On a year over year basis, rents psf increased 1.5%, 1.5% and 2.4% for A, B and C product respectively. The monthly “chunk” rent spread is shown below. Class A product chunk pricing averages a 26.2% premium over B and B product is 17.7% over C.

Monthly Median Rent by Property Class



After tracking fairly consistent for years, a 100-basis point spread in occupancy between A/B versus C product emerged in 2010 and continued through 2q13. Starting in 3q13 the spread moved back to traditional patterns. The 4Q17 results show a widening in the market. Occupancy for all classes typically declines in the fourth quarter due to seasonality of the rental market. The recent slide for Class A product is due to additions to supply in several markets.

Occupancy by Property Class



Summary of Rent, Occupancy & Concession Trends by Submarket

The following trends by submarket are based on our quarterly survey of just under 100,000 units.

Net Rent PSF by Submarket

Submarket	2q14	3Q14	4Q14	1Q15	2Q15	3Q15	4Q15	1Q16	2Q16	3Q16	4Q16	1Q17	2Q17	3Q17	4Q17	1Q18	2Q18	Y/Y Chng	2 Yr Chng
Cook NW	\$1.33	\$1.35	\$1.36	\$1.38	\$1.41	\$1.43	\$1.41	\$1.46	\$1.49	\$1.46	\$1.46	\$1.50	\$1.50	\$1.50	\$1.50	\$1.50	\$1.52	1.4%	1.8%
Cook South	\$1.17	\$1.20	\$1.21	\$1.21	\$1.23	\$1.23	\$1.19	\$1.22	\$1.27	\$1.27	\$1.25	\$1.29	\$1.30	\$1.30	\$1.29	\$1.31	\$1.35	3.9%	6.8%
DuPage	\$1.26	\$1.25	\$1.28	\$1.31	\$1.32	\$1.31	\$1.31	\$1.34	\$1.37	\$1.37	\$1.36	\$1.40	\$1.42	\$1.38	\$1.41	\$1.44	\$1.43	1.2%	4.9%
Kane/Kendall	\$1.17	\$1.17	\$1.18	\$1.20	\$1.22	\$1.22	\$1.23	\$1.26	\$1.27	\$1.29	\$1.27	\$1.29	\$1.29	\$1.30	\$1.26	\$1.32	\$1.34	3.6%	5.9%
Lake	\$1.34	\$1.39	\$1.36	\$1.40	\$1.49	\$1.46	\$1.45	\$1.44	\$1.48	\$1.47	\$1.43	\$1.48	\$1.54	\$1.53	\$1.52	\$1.56	\$1.56	0.9%	5.7%
McHenry	\$1.03	\$1.01	\$1.04	\$1.08	\$1.08	\$1.07	\$1.09	\$1.12	\$1.13	\$1.13	\$1.13	\$1.13	\$1.13	\$1.13	\$1.14	\$1.14	\$1.19	5.5%	5.6%
Naperville/Aurora	\$1.28	\$1.29	\$1.30	\$1.35	\$1.35	\$1.35	\$1.38	\$1.41	\$1.44	\$1.41	\$1.43	\$1.47	\$1.47	\$1.49	\$1.46	\$1.43	\$1.46	-0.5%	1.7%
North Shore	\$2.20	\$2.19	\$2.19	\$2.16	\$2.16	\$2.17	\$2.13	\$2.18	\$2.19	\$2.27	\$2.22	\$2.20	\$2.40	\$2.31	\$2.20	\$2.23	\$2.25	-6.2%	3.0%
Waukegan/Gurnee	\$1.03	\$1.09	\$1.05	\$1.05	\$1.04	\$1.07	\$1.06	\$1.10	\$1.12	\$1.12	\$1.09	\$1.11	\$1.15	\$1.16	\$1.17	\$1.18	\$1.18	3.2%	5.8%
Will	\$1.15	\$1.15	\$1.20	\$1.22	\$1.25	\$1.27	\$1.20	\$1.23	\$1.23	\$1.28	\$1.28	\$1.30	\$1.34	\$1.32	\$1.35	\$1.40	\$1.39	4.3%	13.4%
All Suburban	\$1.25	\$1.27	\$1.29	\$1.32	\$1.34	\$1.33	\$1.34	\$1.39	\$1.41	\$1.38	\$1.39	\$1.44	\$1.45	\$1.45	\$1.44	\$1.45	\$1.47	1.2%	4.5%

Note: Quarterly net rent values are rounded for display purposes but not for Yr/Yr Change calculations.

One Bedroom Median Rent by Submarket

Submarket	2q14	3Q14	4Q14	1Q15	2Q15	3Q15	4Q15	1Q16	2Q16	3Q16	4Q16	1Q17	2Q17	3Q17	4Q17	1Q18	2Q18	Y/Y Chng	2 Yr Chng
Cook NW	\$1,086	\$1,093	\$1,098	\$1,125	\$1,131	\$1,127	\$1,131	\$1,183	\$1,207	\$1,150	\$1,187	\$1,211	\$1,212	\$1,191	\$1,180	\$1,176	\$1,200	-0.9%	-0.5%
Cook South	\$877	\$877	\$872	\$893	\$908	\$908	\$919	\$930	\$1,010	\$990	\$955	\$978	\$1,006	\$1,044	\$1,034	\$1,060	\$1,082	7.6%	7.2%
DuPage	\$1,020	\$1,027	\$1,013	\$1,039	\$1,059	\$1,037	\$1,036	\$1,089	\$1,105	\$1,100	\$1,086	\$1,111	\$1,148	\$1,124	\$1,146	\$1,180	\$1,158	0.9%	4.8%
Kane/Kendall	\$908	\$908	\$930	\$908	\$885	\$885	\$910	\$967	\$930	\$942	\$949	\$1,000	\$981	\$981	\$965	\$981	\$1,050	7.0%	12.9%
Lake	\$1,132	\$1,177	\$1,155	\$1,142	\$1,153	\$1,134	\$1,143	\$1,148	\$1,199	\$1,182	\$1,115	\$1,176	\$1,273	\$1,244	\$1,187	\$1,200	\$1,291	1.5%	7.7%
McHenry	\$804	\$794	\$818	\$831	\$835	\$835	\$866	\$877	\$885	\$885	\$885	\$884	\$874	\$890	\$884	\$871	\$929	6.3%	4.9%
Naperville/Aurora	\$1,136	\$1,123	\$1,151	\$1,162	\$1,203	\$1,203	\$1,188	\$1,251	\$1,249	\$1,240	\$1,259	\$1,252	\$1,283	\$1,320	\$1,289	\$1,258	\$1,298	1.2%	3.9%
North Shore	\$1,829	\$1,752	\$1,725	\$1,782	\$1,776	\$1,728	\$1,701	\$1,754	\$1,842	\$1,858	\$1,828	\$1,799	\$1,922	\$1,894	\$1,830	\$1,832	\$1,891	-1.6%	2.7%
Waukegan/Gurnee	\$823	\$843	\$839	\$854	\$812	\$825	\$823	\$820	\$845	\$812	\$790	\$798	\$810	\$825	\$845	\$845	\$845	4.3%	0.0%
Will	\$804	\$887	\$970	\$935	\$978	\$993	\$965	\$1,015	\$1,015	\$1,035	\$1,008	\$1,050	\$1,050	\$1,050	\$1,050	\$1,050	\$1,095	4.3%	7.9%
All Suburban	\$1,033	\$1,040	\$1,049	\$1,085	\$1,104	\$1,100	\$1,084	\$1,131	\$1,162	\$1,142	\$1,135	\$1,188	\$1,209	\$1,185	\$1,180	\$1,191	\$1,229	1.7%	5.8%

Note: Quarterly net rent values are rounded for display purposes but not for Yr/Yr Change calculations.

Two Bedroom Median Rent by Submarket

Submarket	2q14	3Q14	4Q14	1Q15	2Q15	3Q15	4Q15	1Q16	2Q16	3Q16	4Q16	1Q17	2Q17	3Q17	4Q17	1Q18	2Q18	Y/Y Chng	2 Yr Chng
Cook NW	\$1,281	\$1,275	\$1,278	\$1,334	\$1,343	\$1,340	\$1,348	\$1,394	\$1,408	\$1,375	\$1,390	\$1,419	\$1,446	\$1,400	\$1,414	\$1,385	\$1,422	-1.7%	1.0%
Cook South	\$1,143	\$1,148	\$1,148	\$1,158	\$1,168	\$1,168	\$1,168	\$1,193	\$1,210	\$1,210	\$1,202	\$1,278	\$1,279	\$1,280	\$1,280	\$1,248	\$1,325	3.6%	9.5%
DuPage	\$1,276	\$1,230	\$1,278	\$1,293	\$1,278	\$1,309	\$1,305	\$1,340	\$1,374	\$1,355	\$1,315	\$1,385	\$1,430	\$1,396	\$1,378	\$1,438	\$1,410	-1.4%	2.6%
Kane/Kendall	\$1,089	\$1,116	\$1,184	\$1,185	\$1,225	\$1,250	\$1,183	\$1,270	\$1,363	\$1,246	\$1,246	\$1,288	\$1,345	\$1,337	\$1,321	\$1,369	\$1,440	7.1%	5.7%
Lake	\$1,273	\$1,308	\$1,416	\$1,292	\$1,441	\$1,405	\$1,406	\$1,420	\$1,412	\$1,381	\$1,396	\$1,404	\$1,441	\$1,466	\$1,418	\$1,475	\$1,530	6.2%	8.3%
McHenry	\$963	\$963	\$942	\$958	\$980	\$980	\$988	\$1,010	\$1,003	\$990	\$995	\$1,010	\$1,025	\$1,038	\$1,020	\$1,010	\$1,048	2.2%	4.5%
Naperville/Aurora	\$1,344	\$1,321	\$1,330	\$1,389	\$1,408	\$1,407	\$1,418	\$1,429	\$1,445	\$1,432	\$1,435	\$1,479	\$1,491	\$1,516	\$1,495	\$1,496	\$1,496	0.4%	3.5%
North Shore	\$2,657	\$2,405	\$2,518	\$2,603	\$2,625	\$2,522	\$2,441	\$2,603	\$2,533	\$2,481	\$2,446	\$2,465	\$2,675	\$2,623	\$2,623	\$2,540	\$2,447	-8.5%	-3.4%
Waukegan/Gurnee	\$988	\$1,007	\$1,015	\$988	\$990	\$988	\$1,003	\$1,008	\$1,035	\$1,040	\$1,000	\$1,030	\$1,063	\$1,084	\$1,090	\$1,045	\$1,050	-1.2%	1.4%
Will	\$986	\$993	\$1,034	\$1,080	\$1,099	\$1,155	\$1,099	\$1,125	\$1,116	\$1,180	\$1,185	\$1,200	\$1,206	\$1,181	\$1,258	\$1,296	\$1,279	6.0%	14.6%
All Suburban	\$1,225	\$1,230	\$1,261	\$1,306	\$1,318	\$1,321	\$1,314	\$1,364	\$1,368	\$1,355	\$1,357	\$1,400	\$1,432	\$1,407	\$1,395	\$1,413	\$1,433	0.0%	4.7%

Note: Quarterly net rent values are rounded for display purposes but not for Yr/Yr Change calculations.

Rent Spread - 1BR to 2BR

Submarket	2q14	3Q14	4Q14	1Q15	2Q15	3Q15	4Q15	1Q16	2Q16	3Q16	4Q16	1Q17	2Q17	3Q17	4Q17	1Q18	2Q18	Avg 1 yr	Avg 2 yr
Cook NW	\$195	\$183	\$181	\$209	\$212	\$213	\$216	\$211	\$201	\$225	\$203	\$208	\$235	\$210	\$234	\$209	\$222	-5.6%	10.2%
Cook South	\$266	\$271	\$276	\$265	\$260	\$260	\$249	\$263	\$201	\$221	\$247	\$300	\$273	\$236	\$246	\$188	\$243	-10.9%	21.2%
DuPage	\$256	\$203	\$265	\$253	\$219	\$272	\$269	\$251	\$269	\$255	\$229	\$275	\$283	\$271	\$232	\$258	\$253	-10.6%	-6.0%
Kane/Kendall	\$182	\$209	\$254	\$278	\$340	\$365	\$273	\$303	\$433	\$305	\$297	\$288	\$364	\$356	\$356	\$387	\$390	7.2%	-9.8%
Lake	\$141	\$131	\$261	\$150	\$288	\$271	\$264	\$272	\$214	\$199	\$281	\$229	\$169	\$222	\$231	\$275	\$239	41.5%	11.7%
McHenry	\$159	\$169	\$125	\$127	\$145	\$145	\$122	\$133	\$118	\$105	\$110	\$126	\$151	\$148	\$136	\$139	\$119	-21.5%	1.1%
Naperville/Aurora	\$208	\$198	\$179	\$227	\$205	\$205	\$230	\$178	\$196	\$192	\$176	\$228	\$208	\$196	\$206	\$238	\$198	-5.0%	0.9%
North Shore	\$828	\$654	\$793	\$820	\$849	\$794	\$740	\$849	\$691	\$623	\$618	\$667	\$753	\$728	\$793	\$708	\$555	-26.2%	-19.7%
Waukegan/Gurnee	\$165	\$163	\$177	\$134	\$178	\$163	\$180	\$188	\$190	\$228	\$210	\$232	\$253	\$259	\$245	\$200	\$205	-19.0%	7.9%
Will	\$182	\$106	\$64	\$145	\$122	\$163	\$134	\$110	\$101	\$145	\$178	\$150	\$156	\$131	\$208	\$246	\$184	17.9%	82.8%
All Suburban	\$192	\$190	\$212	\$221	\$215	\$221	\$230	\$234	\$206	\$214	\$222	\$212	\$224	\$222	\$215	\$221	\$203	-9.1%	-1.5%

© 2018 Integra Realty Resources - Chicago

Occupancy by Submarket

Submarket	2q14	3Q14	4Q14	1Q15	2Q15	3Q15	4Q15	1Q16	2Q16	3Q16	4Q16	1Q17	2Q17	3Q17	4Q17	1Q18	2Q18	Y/Y Chng	2 Yr Chng
Cook NW	95.5	96.6	95.8	96.9	96.9	97.3	95.1	96.0	97.2	96.0	95.4	94.1	95.2	95.3	95.4	94.6	94.5	-0.7%	-2.8%
Cook South	94.5	95.3	95.0	95.1	96.4	96.5	95.5	96.1	96.9	96.9	95.9	94.9	95.8	96.3	95.7	94.2	95.4	-0.4%	-1.5%
DuPage	95.1	95.8	95.3	96.1	96.3	96.6	95.3	96.7	97.2	96.1	95.7	94.4	95.4	95.5	95.1	95.0	95.1	-0.3%	-2.1%
Kane/Kendall	94.6	95.2	95.0	96.3	95.7	95.8	96.0	96.7	97.6	96.4	95.2	95.1	96.2	96.1	95.3	96.3	96.9	0.7%	-0.7%
Lake	96.3	96.9	96.9	97.7	98.3	98.0	96.6	97.0	97.5	96.9	95.5	95.0	95.5	95.3	95.8	96.4	96.0	0.6%	-1.5%
McHenry	95.5	95.3	95.3	96.1	96.4	96.1	95.4	96.2	97.9	96.1	95.6	93.9	95.1	96.4	94.8	95.9	93.9	-1.3%	-4.1%
Naperville/Aurora	95.8	96.0	96.1	97.1	97.6	96.9	96.0	96.4	97.1	95.1	95.0	94.4	95.6	94.8	94.4	96.0	95.4	-0.2%	-1.7%
North Shore	91.9	94.8	95.3	96.8	96.4	96.1	94.2	95.4	95.7	95.4	93.8	92.9	94.6	93.8	91.9	92.7	95.2	0.7%	-0.5%
Waukegan/Gurnee	95.3	95.4	94.6	95.6	95.8	96.0	95.2	96.5	96.6	96.8	96.9	95.8	96.0	95.9	95.4	95.7	96.4	0.4%	-0.3%
Will	95.4	95.4	94.7	95.4	95.6	96.4	94.1	95.4	96.1	96.5	95.5	96.7	96.9	96.6	96.0	95.9	95.8	-1.1%	-0.3%
All Suburban	95.2	95.9	95.3	96.3	96.7	96.7	95.4	96.3	97.1	96.1	95.3	94.5	95.5	95.4	95.1	95.2	95.6	0.2%	-1.5%

Note: Quarterly occupancy values are rounded for display purposes but not for Yr/Yr Change calculations.

Concessions by Submarket

Submarket	2q14	3Q14	4Q14	1Q15	2Q15	3Q15	4Q15	1Q16	2Q16	3Q16	4Q16	1Q17	2Q17	3Q17	4Q17	1Q18	2Q18	Y/Y Chng
Cook NW	4.0	4.5	5.4	6.1	6.0	2.5	5.9	7.7	6.2	6.3	7.7	5.6	7.7	7.7	7.7	8.0	6.1	-21.3%
Cook South	8.0	5.9	6.1	5.9	4.8	7.7	5.0	7.7	8.0	7.7	8.0	8.0	7.7	7.7	8.0	7.7	8.0	4.2%
DuPage	7.7	8.3	7.7	7.7	7.7	7.7	7.7	8.0	8.3	7.7	7.7	7.7	6.7	8.3	8.0	7.7	8.0	20.4%
Kane/Kendall	7.7	7.7	7.7	7.7	7.7	7.7	7.7	7.7	7.7	6.7	7.7	8.3	4.7	8.3	7.7	7.0	7.7	62.2%
Lake	8.3	7.2	7.2	8.3	5.6	2.8	8.0	7.1	7.2	8.3	7.6	7.6	6.2	6.2	3.5	10.7	8.3	34.1%
McHenry	8.3	6.2	5.0	6.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	n/a
Naperville/Aurora	8.3	1.7	8.6	4.2	7.5	8.0	5.5	3.5	4.3	6.0	8.3	3.2	6.3	5.4	6.9	8.3	8.3	31.4%
North Shore	8.3	8.3	6.0	4.2	8.3	4.7	8.3	8.3	8.3	8.2	8.0	7.7	8.3	7.4	8.0	8.3	7.7	-7.7%
Waukegan/Gurnee	5.6	8.3	8.3	8.3	8.3	8.3	7.3	5.5	8.3	6.0	7.5	8.3	8.3	8.2	8.3	8.3	5.6	-33.0%
Will	7.0	4.2	6.3	4.2	8.3	8.0	8.3	2.5	5.6	3.7	3.0	7.6	6.3	1.1	8.7	5.4	4.7	-25.5%
All Suburban	7.7	7.7	7.7	7.6	7.7	7.7	7.7	7.7	7.7	7.7	7.7	7.7	7.7	7.7	8.0	8.3	7.7	0.0%

Note: Numbers shown are percentages - 1 month free rent on 12 month lease equals 8.3%.


© 2018 Integra Realty Resources - Chicago

Demand Generators

The apartment market is influenced by a number of factors including employment, homeownership trends and a desire to maintain flexibility.


The unemployment rate for the Chicago MSA is 4.4 percent (National, 4.0 percent) as of June 2018. The national unemployment rate for 25+ year olds with a bachelor's degree is at 2.4 percent.

Chicago vs. National Unemployment Rate – BLS Data



The Chicago market generated an annual average of 75,000 new jobs from 1992-2000 – a trough to peak period. Employment declined from 2000-2003 with peak post-recession employment achieved in 2007 which did not even match the 2000 employment level. The 2016 employment level of 4.684M finally eclipsed the prior 2000 total employment peak of 4.631M.

By looking at the month over month comparisons to prior year employment, the trends in employment become more evident. The rate of growth in employment has declined precipitously over the past two years.



BLS numbers indicate a deceleration in employment growth as follows:

Chicago MSA Employment - Non Farm (000s)


Year	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Empl Chg
2006	4397.8	4411.7	4445.1	4492.2	4529.9	4572.7	4544.3	4547.6	4553.9	4555.2	4570.3	4573.1	
2007	4449.3	4447.5	4487.3	4529.2	4577.6	4610.6	4583.9	4584.5	4579.1	4588.4	4603.8	4601.7	37.425
2008	4470.2	4467.8	4488.1	4533.7	4572.9	4589.3	4563.5	4558.8	4536.4	4533.7	4511.4	4480.3	-28.067
2009	4313.2	4291.5	4283.1	4292.3	4317.7	4321.8	4280.9	4267.7	4265.4	4276.6	4278.0	4263.8	-237.842
2010	4136.8	4145.5	4166.6	4219.7	4274.4	4288.3	4245.4	4254.3	4263.5	4298.0	4310.1	4301.2	-45.683
2011	4181.2	4191.0	4222.4	4280.8	4313.8	4339.4	4324.2	4332.4	4346.7	4358.7	4372.3	4363.1	60.183
2012	4250.1	4261.5	4296.2	4343.4	4385.8	4417.8	4391.0	4403.6	4417.2	4427.3	4446.8	4441.0	71.308
2013	4313.7	4335.2	4363.9	4400.5	4457.0	4489.9	4462.5	4477.0	4480.8	4494.3	4511.5	4513.3	68.158
2014	4373.6	4387.8	4420.3	4474.4	4531.1	4560.6	4533.7	4541.9	4539.3	4568.7	4580.4	4583.5	66.308
2015	4448.4	4464.1	4492.7	4559.5	4618.5	4649.1	4629.7	4628.6	4629.4	4661.6	4667.4	4673.1	85.567
2016	4540.5	4550.0	4575.4	4634.5	4668.6	4703.2	4695.3	4692.4	4691.0	4712.5	4724.4	4715.1	65.067
2017	4583.7	4597.3	4631.8	4664.2	4714.9	4757.4	4722.5	4726.0	4724.0	4754.6	4758.6	4730.9	38.583
2018	4604.8	4632.0	4656.2	4695.1	4750.8	4800.9	4782.1						

Homeownership Trends

Rental demand is being driven by instability in the for-sale housing market, the inability to obtain a mortgage due lack of down payment, debt to income ratios (including the impact of student loans) and/or credit issues. Homeownership rates throughout the region had been on a decline through year end 2011 but rose through 2013 – seemingly pointing to a turn in the market. With the Dodd Frank lending rules starting in January 2014, obtaining a loan has become even more difficult due to increased underwriting requirements. The 2018 tax reform has a positive impact on rental housing due to a) capping the real estate and income tax deductions at \$10,000, b) eliminating interest deductions on home equity loans, c) increasing the exemption levels which eliminates the economic benefit of mortgage interest deductions for most households and d) reduction in the actual tax rates which decreases the value of deductions. In spite of these factors, homeownership spiked in 1Q18 as noted below. This appears to be an anomaly with a return to trend in 2Q18.

Nationally, the homeownership rate showed a decline through mid-2016 with a more recent upward trend. Each percentage point change equates to roughly 30,000 households in the Chicago MSA.

Homeownership Rate – Chicago MSA



The rental market is most heavily influenced by demographic trends in the 25-35 age cohort. This age group is less concerned about owning a home than maintaining flexibility for potential job-related moves. The prospect of tying up funds for a down payment on a home and then worrying about the ability to “cash out” for a move in a timely manner (not to mention getting whole relative to the initial purchase) have weighed on the for-sale market. Renting provides options. While price levels of for sale product have been increasing, it has been overall at a modest rate. There has been pressure on interest rates which will motivate some to act on homeownership. There are few compelling reasons to act now on the purchase of a residence.

From a household formation standpoint, there is pent up demand in the 25-34-year-old cohort as many in this category remain living with parents.

Cook County – Northwest Apartment Submarket Overview

Market area defined. The Cook County Northwest sub market is defined as roughly 294 to the east, Lake County on the north, Route 59 on the west and DuPage County to the south. O'Hare International Airport is at the southeastern most part of the submarket.

Survey property profile. The database for the Cook County – Northwest survey consisted of 25,711 dwelling units. Median unit size for the submarket is 877 square feet which is in-line with the overall suburban market. The median year built was 1975 compared to the overall suburban market having a median of 1986. Cook County Northwest was one of the first submarkets to develop in suburban Chicago to a significant density. The lack of newer product has been more a function of lack of suitable sites for development rather than submarket economics.



Demand drivers. Significant housing demand is driven by the primary employment centers of O'Hare International Airport and its surrounding industrial base in the southeast quadrant, the Schaumburg office/retail market in the northwest and the I-88 office corridor to the south. The office market remains plagued by high vacancy.

Rent Trends & Concessions. Median net rent per square foot currently stands at \$1.52 – up 1.4% from a year ago. Rents in the Northwest Cook submarket are up 1.8 percent compared to the levels posted two years ago. One-bedrooms have a median rent of \$1,200 while two bedrooms have a median net rent of \$1,422.

The value of the concession stands at just under one month free rent. Concessions will remain in the market.


Occupancy. Occupancy is down 70 bps from 95.2 percent a year ago to the current level of 94.5 percent. The submarket remains relatively “full” with pricing therefore expected to remain stable.

Market Revenue Performance. Market performance is a function of the product of net rent and occupancy.

Market Revenue Performance

Net Rent PSF x Occupancy

(c) 2018 Integra Realty Resources




The Northwest Cook submarket has been tracking consistent with the overall suburban market. Performance leveled off in 2016 with a modest gain through the current quarter.

Cook County-Northwest Apartments - 2q18

Showing (a) median trend line and (b) middle 2/3rds surveyed (thick bars).


Net Rent PSF - \$1.52




Snapshot & Trends

Cook Cnty NW		Suburban Metro
66	Complexes	327
25,711	Units	98,560
877	SF/unit	909
1975	Yr Built	1986
\$1.52 →	Net PSF	\$1.47 →
94.5% ↘	Occupancy	95.6% →
31.8% →	Pct W/concessions	29.1% →
6.1% →	Concession Amt	7.7% →
\$1,200 →	One Bdrm/Mo	\$1,229 ↗
\$1,422 →	Two Bdrm/Mo	\$1,433 →


Occupancy - 94.5%




Net One Bdrm - \$1,200/mo



Concessions - 6.1% when offered




Net Two Bdrm - \$1,422/mo



Suburban Multi-Family Housing Supply

Integra Realty Resources - Chicago has been tracking rental apartment construction on an annual basis since 1996. Since that time, there have been over 24,600 units delivered to the suburban market plus an additional 6,177 which are currently under construction and delivering in 2018 and 2019.



Over the past ten years however, incredibly little product had been added to the market. This was driven by a few factors including:

- Poor economics due to job losses in the region creating vacancies and concessions, though performance has improved since late 2009
- Lower interest rate and low down payment environment driving demand for new condo unit construction which generated more immediate returns; however, the new construction condo market is now stalled.
- Resistance of communities to allow for new rental developments
- Few well located sites left in the region suitable for large scale development
- Rent levels not high enough to support construction costs at locations where sites can be acquired

With many communities welcoming rental development, combined with feasible rent levels supporting construction, development is once again occurring throughout the region.

While there was a large amount of development activity which occurred in the late 1990s through the very early 2000s, apartment development virtually ceased and did not begin again until 2013. Since that time, there has been a significant increase in the new apartment development activity. However, given the size of the suburban metropolitan area, the number of new apartments being added to the market is still quite small.

History of Recent Deliveries: 2016-2017 and 2018-2019

The most recent additions to the suburban market include the following buildings which delivered in 2016-2017 along with the buildings which are currently under construction for delivery in 2018-2019:

2016-2017 Deliveries

© 2018 Integra Realty Resources - Chicago

Property	Submarket	City	Developer	Status	Units	Delivered
500 Station Boulevard	Aurora - Naperville	Aurora	Goel/TCCI	Leasing	417	2016
Metro 59	Aurora - Naperville	Aurora	Next Gen/Avgeris	Leasing	232	2016
Northgate Crossing	Cook NW	Wheeling	Reva	Stabilized	300	2016
Wheaton Courthouse Square	DuPage	Wheaton	Focus	Stabilized	149	2016
Elmhurst 255	DuPage	Elmhurst	Morningside	Stabilized	192	2016
Apex 41	DuPage	Lombard	Glenstar	Leasing	181	2016
Walnut Ridge	McHenry	Woodstock	Cunat	Stabilized	108	2016
The Main	North Shore	Evanston	O'Donnell	Stabilized	112	2016
Northshore 770	North Shore	Northbrook	Morningside	Leasing	347	2016
Vantage Oak Park	South Cook	Oak Park	LSI/Golub/Wood	Stabilized	270	2016
Residences of Orland Park Crossing	South Cook	Orland Park	Reva	Stabilized	231	2016
Springs at Weber	Will	Romeoville	Continental Properties	Stabilized	292	2016
North 680	Cook NW	Schaumburg	UrbanStreet	Stabilized	192	2017
The Residences at Hamilton Lakes	DuPage	Itasca	M&R/Hamilton	Leasing	297	2017
Springs at Orchard Rd	Kane	North Aurora	Continental Properties	Leasing	300	2017
Centrum Evanston/Davis & Maple	North Shore	Evanston	Centrum	Stabilized	101	2017
McGovern House	North Shore	Highland Park	Merdingner	Stabilized	73	2017
The Residences of Wilmette/611 Green Bay	North Shore	Wilmette	M&R	Leasing	75	2017
Uptown LaGrange	South Cook	LaGrange	Opus	Leasing	254	2017
The Emerson/Lake/Westgate/North	South Cook	Oak Park	Clark Street/Lennar	Leasing	271	2017
The Brook on Janes	Will	Bolingbrook	Lennar	Stabilized	280	2017

2018-2019 Deliveries: Leasing & Under Construction

© 2018 Integra Realty Resources - Chicago

Property	Submarket	City	Developer	Status	Units
One Apts/Wheeling Town Center	Cook NW	Wheeling	Lynmark/Urban R2	Construction	301
Parkview Apts, 212 N. Dunton	Cook NW	Arlington Heights	Cullen Davis	Leasing	45
Buckingham Place/Littelfuse site/800 E NW Hwy	Cook NW	Des Plaines	Dearborn-Buckingham	Leasing	270
Sim's Bowl/1555-65 Ellinwood	Cook NW	Des Plaines	Opus/Berkshire	Construction	113
20West/ 20 W Northwest Why	Cook NW	Mt Prospect	Nicholas & Assoc	Construction	73
Covington Lexington Woods/Golf & E River Rd	Cook NW	Des Plaines	Lexington	Construction	236
Marq on Main/Main St & Burlington	DuPage	Lisle	Marquette	Leasing	201
Overture Yorktown/Yorktown Mall (55+)	DuPage	Lombard	Greystar	Construction	175
Elan Yorktown/Yorktown Mall	DuPage	Lombard	Greystar	Construction	295
Lakeside Village/200 Royce	DuPage	Oak Brook Terr	Interforum	Construction	315
NWC Addison & First	DuPage	Elmhurst	Opus	Construction	164
Main & Maple	DuPage	Downers Grove	Trammel Crow	Construction	115
Burlington Station	DuPage	Downers Grove	Holladay	Construction	89
Springs at South Elgin/Gyorr Rd & Sterns	Kane	South Elgin	Continental Properties	Construction	300
Reserve at Grengs Park	Kane	Geneva	Shodeen	Leasing	42
Prairie Centre Phase I/St Charles Mall	Kane	St Charles	Shodeen	Construction	96
Prairie Winds of St Charles/NS Bricher	Kane	St Charles	Big Rock	Leasing	250
Watermark at the Grove/WS Randall	Kane	Elgin	Interstate Partners	Construction	282
Springs at Canterfield/ES Rt 31 N of I-90	Kane	West Dundee	Continental Properties	Leasing	260
The Atworth at Melody Farms/Milw & Town Ln	Lake	Vernon Hills	Focus	Leasing	260
444 Social/SWC Aptakistic & Pkwy/Regal site	Lake	Lincolnshire	ECD/Greenberg	Leasing	302
Deer Park Crossing/Field Pkwy	Lake	Deer Park	Reva	Leasing	236
101 West/101 W Liberty St	Lake	Barrington	Monroe Residential	Leasing	64
Kelmscott Park Apts/NWC Laurel & Western	North Shore	Lake Forest	Focus	Leasing	111
811 Emerson	North Shore	Evanston	CA & Focus	Construction	242
8000 North/NWC Lincoln & Oak	North Shore	Skokie	Greenspire/Pontarelli	Construction	153
Avidor Glenview/650 Waukegan (55+age)	North Shore	Glenview	Trammel Crow	Construction	168
1000 Skokie Blvd/Sunset Ridge	North Shore	Northbrook	Finger	Construction	304
SEC Harlem & South Blvd	South Cook	Oak Park	Lincoln	Construction	250
NWC Lake & Forest	South Cook	Oak Park	Albion	Construction	265
Grande Park Apts/SWC 127th & Ridge	Will	Plainfield	Wilmette RE	Construction	200
2018-2019 Deliveries					6,177

Deliveries by Submarket


Since 2013, the North Shore submarket has seen the largest surge of activity. Given the size of the submarket, this has been a substantial increase in the base with absorption in the newer product slowing notably in the latter half of 2015. Concessions are now more prevalent in this market. The remaining submarkets have added relatively few units.

Of particular note is the small amount of new development activity which had occurred in the Northwest Cook submarket until very recently. This market has a high concentration of Class B and C buildings with pent up demand for Class A product and developers are now pursuing an increasing number of new developments in the Northwest Cook submarket.

Following is a delivery distribution by submarket for the developments which will have delivered through 2017, along with the buildings which are currently under construction/being delivered in 2018 and 2019.

Suburban Apt Deliveries by Submarket: 1996-2017 Projects Currently Under Construction - Delivering 2018-2019


(c) 2018 Integra Realty Resources - Chicago



Suburban Apt Deliveries by Submarket: 1996-2017

Projects Currently Under Construction - Delivering 2018-2019

(c) 2018 Integra Realty Resources - Chicago



Current Status - Selected Projects/Sites

We are tracking many development sites where new product is being proposed. Locations range from the North Shore markets out to Kane and the South Cook submarkets. A few sites have been approved for development by the local municipalities; however, several projects have not moved forward either due to rents not being high enough to support construction costs or the inability to obtain either the equity or a construction loan. Some projects classified as “confidential” are consulting assignments for which we have been retained but are not yet public.

The proposed projects are typically 150 to 300 units and are widely distributed throughout the region. There are numerous additional sites in the region proposed for multi-family.

Rental Apartment Pipeline/Projects in Planning

Property	Submarket	City	Developer	Status	Units
North Shore					
1450 Sherman	North Shore	Evanston	Albion	Planning	286
1727 Oak (55+ age restricted)	North Shore	Evanston	Trammel Crow	Planning	169
The Legacy/1621 Chicago	North Shore	Evanston	Horizon	Planning	215
1555 Oak - adaptive reuse	North Shore	Evanston	Cameel Halim	Planning	80-90
Karger Center property/1850 Green Bay Rd	North Shore	Highland Park	Albion	Planning	171
One Winnetka/Elm & Lincoln	North Shore	Winnetka	Stonestreet/Trandel	Planning	36
87 Hundred/8700 Waukegan	North Shore	Morton Grove	Equibase/Heartland	Planning	184
Bess Hardware site/1850 Glenview Rd	North Shore	Glenview	Drake	Planning	72
Deerbrook Center site/SWC Lake&Waukegan	North Shore	Deerfield	Reva	Planning	248
Confidential	North Shore	Confidential	Confidential	Planning	TBD
Lake County					
Station Square/Trimm Property	Lake	Libertyville	Swanson	Planning	92
Former Kmart/225 S Rand	Lake	Lake Zurich	Garden Homes	Planning	162
NWC Rt 22 & Old Rand Rd	Lake	Lake Zurich	MBR Properties	Planning	100
Confidential	Lake	Confidential	Confidential	Planning	TBD
Cook County NW					
Uptown 500/501 W Dundee	Cook NW	Wheeling	DAC/Atlas	Planning	321
Ellinwood Apts/SEC Ellinwood & Graceland	Cook NW	Des Plaines	Bayview-Compasspoint	Planning	212
Maple St Lofts/215-225 E Prospect	Cook NW	Mt Prospect	Nicholas & Assoc	Planning	300
Veridian/Motorola site	Cook NW	Schaumburg	UrbanStreet	Planning	TBD
Plum Farms/NWC Rts 59 & 72	Cook NW	Hoffman Estates	Iatarola	Planning	253
AT&T Campus/Hoffman Estates	Cook NW	Hoffman Estates	Somerseset	Planning	379
NWC Lake & Church	Cook NW	Hanover Park	Monroe Residential	Planning	131
Hickory Apartments, NWC Hickory & Kensington	Cook NW	Arlington Heights	Neri	Planning	76
Arlington Downs - multiple phases	Cook NW	Arlington Heights	Springbank/Trandel	Planning	263
Arlington Downs - multiple phases	Cook NW	Arlington Heights	Springbank/Trandel	Planning	360
Northwest Hwy & Walnut	Cook NW	Arlington Heights	Brian Properties	Planning	106
Kane County					
Vistas of Mill Creek	Kane	Geneva	Shodeen	Planning	268
Charlestown Mall site/E of K NS E Main	Kane	St Charles	Krausz Companies	Planning	256
Confidential	Kane	Confidential	Confidential	Planning	220
One Washington Place/NWC Wash. & Wilson	Kane	Batavia	Shodeen	Planning	190
Reserve at Hudson Crossing/Frmr Alexdr Lumber	Kane	Oswego	Shodeen	Planning	176
Springs at Oswego	Kane	Oswego	Continental Properties	Planning	280
Randall Oaks/WS Randall N of Randall Comm	Kane	North Aurora	Shodeen	Planning	261
McHenry County					
Grove Residences/Rt 14 near Illinois	McHenry	Fox River Grove	Gart Partners	Planning	300
DuPage County					
SEC Main & Ogden	DuPage	Lisle	Flaherty & Collins	Planning	164
Woodmoor on Finley Road/frmr Ken-Loch	DuPage	Uninc/Lombard	UrbanStreet/Atlas	Planning	388
McChesney & Miller site	DuPage	Glen Ellyn	Springbank/Trandel	Planning	245
Duane/Melrose	DuPage	Glen Ellyn	Reva	Planning	48
Geische Shoes/NWC Main & Hillside	DuPage	Glen Ellyn	GSP - Debb/Kosich	Planning	107
Cantera Residences/Ferry W of Winfield Rd	DuPage	Warrenville	Interforum	Planning	364
Vanguard Cantera/Regal Theatre site/Diehl Rd	DuPage	Warrenville	Covington Realty	Planning	242
Everton Reserve/M/I Homes site - ES Rt 59	DuPage	Warrenville	Atlantic Realty Partners	Planning	259
Downers Grove Civic Center site	DuPage	Downers Grove	Next Gen	Planning	234
One North Cass / Cass & Burlington	DuPage	Westmont	Gammonley	Planning	208
Confidential	DuPage	Confidential	Confidential	Planning	TBD
Aurora Naperville					
5th Avenue	Aurora/Naperville	Naperville	Ryan	Planning	400
South Cook					
Residence at Brookside Glen/SW 191st & 80th	South Cook	Tinley Park	Mayher/DJM	Planning	144
Will County					
Highland Ridge Apts/143rd & W of 355	Will	Lockport	Equibase/Heartland	Planning	240
Cedarlake Village/WS Wallin NS Lockport St	Will	Plainfield	Buckingham	Planning	280
Village Place Apts/Normantown E of Brunswick	Will	Romeoville	Rose/S.R. Jacobsen	Planning	216
Highpoint Town Square	Will	Romeoville	HPTS	Planning	72

Conclusions

With an average delivery of roughly 1,100 units per year in the suburban market since 1996, the addition to overall supply has been minimal. Combined with the number of condo conversions that occurred in the market in the early 2000s, the supply of rental units has actually seen a decline. While certain submarkets are adequately supplied with rental units at this time, we believe opportunities exist to create additional rental product. The diverse employment base for the MSA and our direct surveys of buildings in the market indicates a strong long-term picture for multi-family rental product.

Difficulties remain however in securing large enough sites suitable for development and obtaining the necessary zoning approvals in light of general community opposition to rental development. As shown, these factors are contributing to a shift in development to more high-density sites – potentially in redeveloping downtown markets as transit-oriented developments. The costs of construction remain high (\$250+/- psf) for these mid-rise structures (concrete construction) and while demand may certainly exist, the feasible rent levels will be catering to the upper end of the market. While adding supply of substance appears improbable at this point in the MSA overall, we note a significant increase in new construction activity.

Economic Analysis

Chicago MSA Area Analysis

The subject is located in the Chicago-Naperville-Elgin, IL-IN-WI Metropolitan Statistical Area, hereinafter called the Chicago MSA, as defined by the U.S. Office of Management and Budget. The Chicago MSA is 7,197 square miles in size, and is the third most populous metropolitan area in the nation.

Population

The Chicago MSA has an estimated 2018 population of 9,504,650, which represents an average annual 0.1% increase over the 2010 census of 9,461,105. The Chicago MSA added an average of 5,443 residents per year over the 2010-2018 period, and its growth in population contrasts with the State of Illinois which had a 0.1% average annual decrease in population over this time.

Looking forward, the Chicago MSA's population is projected to increase at a 0.1% annual rate from 2018-2023, equivalent to the addition of an average of 5,403 residents per year. The Chicago MSA's population growth differs from Illinois, which is projected to have little or no change in population during this time.

Population Trends					
	Population			Compound Ann. % Chng	
	2010 Census	2018 Estimate	2023 Projection	2010 - 2018	2018 - 2023
Chicago-Naperville-Elgin, IL-IN-WI (Metro)	9,461,105	9,504,650	9,531,666	0.1%	0.1%
Illinois	12,830,632	12,768,442	12,745,779	-0.1%	0.0%

Source: Environics Analytics

Employment

Total employment in the Chicago MSA is currently estimated at 4,683,800 jobs. Between year-end 2006 and the present, employment rose by 110,700 jobs, equivalent to a 2.4% increase over the entire period. There were gains in employment in eight out of the past ten years despite the national economic downturn and slow recovery. The Chicago MSA's rate of employment growth over the last decade surpassed that of Illinois, which experienced an increase in employment of 0.9% or 53,600 jobs over this period.

A comparison of unemployment rates is another way of gauging an area's economic health. Over the past decade, the Chicago MSA has had a 7.5% average unemployment rate, which is the same as the rate for Illinois. The two areas are performing similarly according to this measure.

Recent data shows that the Chicago MSA unemployment rate is 4.1% in comparison to a 4.7% rate for Illinois, a positive sign that is consistent with the fact that the Chicago MSA has outperformed Illinois in the rate of job growth over the past two years.

Employment Trends

Year	Total Employment (Year End)				Unemployment Rate (Ann. Avg.)	
	Chicago MSA	% Change	Illinois	% Change	Chicago MSA	Illinois
2006	4,573,100		6,000,000		4.2%	4.2%
2007	4,601,700	0.6%	6,034,200	0.6%	4.9%	5.0%
2008	4,480,100	-2.6%	5,897,800	-2.3%	6.1%	6.3%
2009	4,264,100	-4.8%	5,628,000	-4.6%	10.2%	10.2%
2010	4,302,400	0.9%	5,686,100	1.0%	10.6%	10.4%
2011	4,363,000	1.4%	5,745,800	1.0%	9.9%	9.7%
2012	4,440,700	1.8%	5,823,400	1.4%	9.1%	9.0%
2013	4,513,200	1.6%	5,880,000	1.0%	9.1%	9.1%
2014	4,583,400	1.6%	5,969,300	1.5%	7.1%	7.1%
2015	4,674,100	2.0%	6,052,600	1.4%	5.9%	6.0%
2016	4,683,800	0.2%	6,053,600	0.0%	5.8%	5.9%
Overall Change 2006-2016	110,700	2.4%	53,600	0.9%		
Avg Unemp. Rate 2006-2016					7.5%	7.5%
Unemployment Rate - December 2017					4.1%	4.7%

Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics and Economy.com. Employment figures are from the Current Employment Survey (CES). Unemployment rates are from the Current Population Survey (CPS). The figures are not seasonally adjusted.

Major employers in the Chicago MSA are shown in the following table.

Major Employers - Chicago-Naperville-Elgin, IL-IN-WI (Metro)

	Name	Number of Employees
1	U.S. Government	42,887
2	Chicago Public Schools	27,406
3	City of Chicago	30,276
4	Cook County	21,795
5	Advocate Healthcare	18,308
6	University of Chicago	16,197
7	Northwestern Memorial Healthcare	15,317
8	State of Illinois	15,136
9	JP Morgan Chase & Co	14,158
10	United Continental Holdings, Inc.	14,000
11	Health Care Service Corp.	13,006
12	Walgreens Boots Alliance, Inc.	13,006
13	Presence Health	10,500
14	Abbott Laboratories	10,000
15	Northwestern University	9,708
16	Jewel-Osco	9,660
17	Chicago Transit Authority	9,510
18	University of Illinois at Chicago	9,212
19	American Airlines Group, Inc.	8,900
20	Rush University Medical Center	8,273
21	AT&T Inc.	8,000
22	Allstate Corp.	7,800
23	Walmart Stores, Inc.	7,700
24	Employco USA Inc.	7,409
25	Aon PLC	7,335

Source: Crain's Chicago Business

Date: January 18, 2017

Gross Domestic Product

The Chicago MSA is the third largest metropolitan area economy in the nation based on Gross Domestic Product (GDP).

Economic growth, as measured by annual changes in GDP, has been somewhat higher in the Chicago MSA than Illinois overall during the past eight years. The Chicago MSA has grown at a 1.4% average annual rate while Illinois has grown at a 1.2% rate. As the national economy improves, the Chicago MSA has recently performed similarly to Illinois. GDP for the Chicago MSA rose by 0.9% in 2016 while Illinois's GDP rose by 0.9%.

The Chicago MSA has a per capita GDP of \$59,810, which is 11% greater than Illinois's GDP of \$54,091. This means that Chicago MSA industries and employers are adding relatively more value to the economy than their counterparts in Illinois.

Gross Domestic Product

Year	(\$ Mil) Chicago MSA	% Change	(\$ Mil) Illinois	% Change
2009	516,764		638,032	
2010	522,484	1.1%	645,983	1.2%
2011	529,860	1.4%	658,411	1.9%
2012	545,392	2.9%	671,493	2.0%
2013	543,676	-0.3%	669,261	-0.3%
2014	552,758	1.7%	679,343	1.5%
2015	563,789	2.0%	686,010	1.0%
2016	568,969	0.9%	692,453	0.9%
Compound % Chg (2009-2016)		1.4%		1.2%
GDP Per Capita 2016	\$59,810		\$54,091	

Source: Bureau of Economic Analysis and Economy.com; data released September 2016. The release of state and local GDP data has a longer lag time than national data. The data represents inflation-adjusted "real" GDP stated in 2009 dollars.

Income, Education and Age

The Chicago MSA has a higher level of household income than Illinois. Median household income for the Chicago MSA is \$69,412, which is 8.3% greater than the corresponding figure for Illinois.


Median Household Income - 2018

	Median
Chicago-Naperville-Elgin, IL-IN-WI (Metro)	\$69,412
Illinois	\$64,068
Comparison of Chicago-Naperville-Elgin, IL-IN-WI (Metro) to Illinois	+ 8.3%

Source: Environics Analytics

Residents of the Chicago MSA have a higher level of educational attainment than those of Illinois. An estimated 36% of Chicago MSA residents are college graduates with four-year degrees, versus 33% of Illinois residents. People in the Chicago MSA are similar in age to their Illinois counterparts. The median age of both the Chicago MSA and Illinois is 38 years.

Education & Age - 2018



Source: Environics Analytics


Conclusion

The Chicago MSA economy will benefit from a stable to slightly growing population base and higher income and education levels. The Chicago MSA experienced growth in the number of jobs over the past decade, and it is reasonable to assume that employment growth will occur in the future. Moreover, the Chicago MSA gains strength from being the third most populous metropolitan area in the country and having both a higher rate of GDP growth and a higher level of GDP per capita than Illinois overall. We anticipate that the Chicago MSA economy will improve and employment will grow, strengthening the demand for real estate.

Demographic Trends – 2018 Statistics

In researching the demographics of the target market area, we have provided data from Envionics Analytics for the demographics of the residents located within the one, three and five mile radii of the subject property. This includes information relating to the 2000 U.S. Census, 2018 estimates (based upon the 2010 census), and 2023 projections for the area.

We fully recognize that while the demographics provide insights on the existing population, demand for the subject units will come from both the immediate market area and from outside this market area.



Location Map – Arlington Heights One, Three and Five Mile Radii

Demographics

A demographic profile of the surrounding area, including population, households, and income data, is presented in the following table.

Surrounding Area Demographics					
2018 Estimates	1-Mile Radius	3-Mile Radius	5-Mile Radius	Chicago-Naperville-Elgin, IL-IN-WI (Metro)	Illinois
Population 2010	18,530	120,480	309,970	9,461,105	12,830,632
Population 2018	18,445	118,813	309,435	9,504,650	12,768,442
Population 2023	18,362	117,837	308,862	9,531,666	12,745,779
Compound % Change 2010-2018	-0.1%	-0.2%	0.0%	0.1%	-0.1%
Compound % Change 2018-2023	-0.1%	-0.2%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%
Households 2010	7,676	48,116	121,847	3,475,726	4,836,972
Households 2018	7,757	48,034	122,983	3,528,983	4,859,251
Households 2023	7,772	47,863	123,266	3,553,670	4,868,017
Compound % Change 2010-2018	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%	0.2%	0.1%
Compound % Change 2018-2023	0.0%	-0.1%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%
Median Household Income 2018	\$105,836	\$87,102	\$81,939	\$69,412	\$64,068
Average Household Size	2.4	2.5	2.5	2.7	2.6
College Graduate %	56%	47%	45%	36%	33%
Median Age	43	43	41	38	38
Owner Occupied %	74%	79%	73%	66%	67%
Renter Occupied %	26%	21%	27%	34%	33%
Median Owner Occupied Housing Value	\$377,458	\$324,608	\$310,486	\$242,814	\$196,422
Median Year Structure Built	1964	1969	1973	1969	1969
Avg. Travel Time to Work in Min.	34	32	31	35	32

Source: Envirionics Analytics

As shown above, the current population within a 3-mile radius of the subject is 118,813, and the average household size is 2.5. Population in the area has declined since the 2010 census, and this trend is projected to continue over the next five years. This is in contrast to the population of the Chicago MSA, which is projected to grow slightly.

Median household income is \$87,102, which is higher than the household income for the Chicago MSA. Residents within a 3-mile radius have a considerably higher level of educational attainment than those of the Chicago MSA, and median owner-occupied home values are also considerably higher.

Renter and Owner Household Demographics

In addition, we have provided information from Ribbon Demographics which analyzes the individual household segments in the five mile radius, showing the information separately for the renter and owner households.



Arlington 425 Development (Proposed Construction)

Renter Household Demographics – 5 mile radius from Subject Property



HISTA 2.2 Summary Data

© 2018 All rights reserved

Arlington Heights, IL PMA

Powered by Claritas

Renter Households						
Age 15 to 54 Years						
Year 2018 Estimates						
	1-Person Household	2-Person Household	3-Person Household	4-Person Household	5+-Person Household	Total
\$0-10,000	406	197	229	185	74	1,091
\$10,000-20,000	381	330	161	128	230	1,230
\$20,000-30,000	1,037	504	343	328	233	2,445
\$30,000-40,000	865	467	371	418	512	2,633
\$40,000-50,000	1,081	516	438	384	423	2,842
\$50,000-60,000	1,386	643	288	280	165	2,762
\$60,000-75,000	1,324	927	800	362	179	3,592
\$75,000-100,000	1,018	1,318	780	483	235	3,834
\$100,000-125,000	880	755	330	364	234	2,563
\$125,000-150,000	245	474	226	116	111	1,172
\$150,000-200,000	169	277	292	102	60	900
\$200,000+	275	233	182	208	42	940
Total	9,067	6,641	4,440	3,358	2,498	26,004

Renter Households						
Aged 55+ Years						
Year 2018 Estimates						
	1-Person Household	2-Person Household	3-Person Household	4-Person Household	5+-Person Household	Total
\$0-10,000	776	97	17	18	20	928
\$10,000-20,000	1,299	359	29	42	24	1,753
\$20,000-30,000	1,031	273	59	28	50	1,441
\$30,000-40,000	582	233	65	31	31	942
\$40,000-50,000	477	248	51	55	50	881
\$50,000-60,000	363	241	57	26	40	727
\$60,000-75,000	422	286	73	111	29	921
\$75,000-100,000	442	308	140	37	14	941
\$100,000-125,000	223	118	58	33	107	539
\$125,000-150,000	242	214	28	101	48	633
\$150,000-200,000	220	89	28	26	7	370
\$200,000+	255	162	94	17	14	542
Total	6,332	2,628	699	525	434	10,618

Renter Households						
All Age Groups						
Year 2018 Estimates						
	1-Person Household	2-Person Household	3-Person Household	4-Person Household	5+-Person Household	Total
\$0-10,000	1,182	294	246	203	94	2,019
\$10,000-20,000	1,680	689	190	170	254	2,983
\$20,000-30,000	2,068	777	402	356	283	3,886
\$30,000-40,000	1,447	700	436	449	543	3,575
\$40,000-50,000	1,558	764	489	439	473	3,723
\$50,000-60,000	1,749	884	345	306	205	3,489
\$60,000-75,000	1,746	1,213	873	473	208	4,513
\$75,000-100,000	1,460	1,626	920	520	249	4,775
\$100,000-125,000	1,103	873	388	397	341	3,102
\$125,000-150,000	487	688	254	217	159	1,805
\$150,000-200,000	389	366	320	128	67	1,270
\$200,000+	530	395	276	225	56	1,482
Total	15,399	9,269	5,139	3,883	2,932	36,622



HISTA 2.2 Summary Data

© 2018 All rights reserved

Arlington Heights, IL PMA

Powered by Claritas

Percent Renter Households						
Age 15 to 54 Years						
Year 2018 Estimates						
	1-Person Household	2-Person Household	3-Person Household	4-Person Household	5+-Person Household	Total
\$0-10,000	1.6%	0.8%	0.9%	0.7%	0.3%	4.2%
\$10,000-20,000	1.5%	1.3%	0.6%	0.5%	0.9%	4.7%
\$20,000-30,000	4.0%	1.9%	1.3%	1.3%	0.9%	9.4%
\$30,000-40,000	3.3%	1.8%	1.4%	1.6%	2.0%	10.1%
\$40,000-50,000	4.2%	2.0%	1.7%	1.5%	1.6%	10.9%
\$50,000-60,000	5.3%	2.5%	1.1%	1.1%	0.6%	10.6%
\$60,000-75,000	5.1%	3.6%	3.1%	1.4%	0.7%	13.8%
\$75,000-100,000	3.9%	5.1%	3.0%	1.9%	0.9%	14.7%
\$100,000-125,000	3.4%	2.9%	1.3%	1.4%	0.9%	9.9%
\$125,000-150,000	0.9%	1.8%	0.9%	0.4%	0.4%	4.5%
\$150,000-200,000	0.6%	1.1%	1.1%	0.4%	0.2%	3.5%
\$200,000+	1.1%	0.9%	0.7%	0.8%	0.2%	3.6%
Total	34.9%	25.5%	17.1%	12.9%	9.6%	100.0%

Percent Renter Households						
Aged 55+ Years						
Year 2018 Estimates						
	1-Person Household	2-Person Household	3-Person Household	4-Person Household	5+-Person Household	Total
\$0-10,000	7.3%	0.9%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	8.7%
\$10,000-20,000	12.2%	3.4%	0.3%	0.4%	0.2%	16.5%
\$20,000-30,000	9.7%	2.6%	0.6%	0.3%	0.5%	13.6%
\$30,000-40,000	5.5%	2.2%	0.6%	0.3%	0.3%	8.9%
\$40,000-50,000	4.5%	2.3%	0.5%	0.5%	0.5%	8.3%
\$50,000-60,000	3.4%	2.3%	0.5%	0.2%	0.4%	6.8%
\$60,000-75,000	4.0%	2.7%	0.7%	1.0%	0.3%	8.7%
\$75,000-100,000	4.2%	2.9%	1.3%	0.3%	0.1%	8.9%
\$100,000-125,000	2.1%	1.1%	0.5%	0.3%	1.0%	5.1%
\$125,000-150,000	2.3%	2.0%	0.3%	1.0%	0.5%	6.0%
\$150,000-200,000	2.1%	0.8%	0.3%	0.2%	0.1%	3.5%
\$200,000+	2.4%	1.5%	0.9%	0.2%	0.1%	5.1%
Total	59.6%	24.8%	6.6%	4.9%	4.1%	100.0%

Percent Renter Households						
All Age Groups						
Year 2018 Estimates						
	1-Person Household	2-Person Household	3-Person Household	4-Person Household	5+-Person Household	Total
\$0-10,000	3.2%	0.8%	0.7%	0.6%	0.3%	5.5%
\$10,000-20,000	4.6%	1.9%	0.5%	0.5%	0.7%	8.1%
\$20,000-30,000	5.6%	2.1%	1.1%	1.0%	0.8%	10.6%
\$30,000-40,000	4.0%	1.9%	1.2%	1.2%	1.5%	9.8%
\$40,000-50,000	4.3%	2.1%	1.3%	1.2%	1.3%	10.2%
\$50,000-60,000	4.8%	2.4%	0.9%	0.8%	0.6%	9.5%
\$60,000-75,000	4.8%	3.3%	2.4%	1.3%	0.6%	12.3%
\$75,000-100,000	4.0%	4.4%	2.5%	1.4%	0.7%	13.0%
\$100,000-125,000	3.0%	2.4%	1.1%	1.1%	0.9%	8.5%
\$125,000-150,000	1.3%	1.9%	0.7%	0.6%	0.4%	4.9%
\$150,000-200,000	1.1%	1.0%	0.9%	0.3%	0.2%	3.5%
\$200,000+	1.4%	1.1%	0.8%	0.6%	0.2%	4.0%
Total	42.0%	25.3%	14.0%	10.6%	8.0%	100.0%

Owner Household Demographics – 5 mile radius from Subject Property



HISTA 2.2 Summary Data

Arlington Heights, IL PMA

© 2018 All rights reserved

Powered by Claritas

Owner Households						
Age 15 to 54 Years						
Year 2018 Estimates						
	1-Person Household	2-Person Household	3-Person Household	4-Person Household	5+-Person Household	Total
\$0-10,000	348	87	64	51	104	654
\$10,000-20,000	200	100	76	66	49	491
\$20,000-30,000	312	122	285	143	305	1,167
\$30,000-40,000	362	240	227	186	347	1,362
\$40,000-50,000	700	376	419	383	439	2,317
\$50,000-60,000	409	370	322	360	511	1,972
\$60,000-75,000	810	708	671	832	493	3,514
\$75,000-100,000	1,089	1,453	1,559	1,414	779	6,294
\$100,000-125,000	550	1,300	1,478	1,910	1,053	6,291
\$125,000-150,000	210	1,149	1,141	1,780	1,096	5,376
\$150,000-200,000	191	1,278	1,218	2,276	1,797	6,760
\$200,000+	516	1,224	1,701	2,638	1,557	7,636
Total	5,697	8,407	9,161	12,039	8,530	43,834

Owner Households						
Aged 55+ Years						
Year 2018 Estimates						
	1-Person Household	2-Person Household	3-Person Household	4-Person Household	5+-Person Household	Total
\$0-10,000	922	530	128	47	46	1,673
\$10,000-20,000	2,340	606	108	29	19	3,102
\$20,000-30,000	2,939	1,456	243	88	39	4,765
\$30,000-40,000	1,965	2,040	292	57	42	4,396
\$40,000-50,000	1,730	1,811	267	94	91	3,993
\$50,000-60,000	1,242	1,631	381	99	83	3,436
\$60,000-75,000	1,569	2,447	574	206	50	4,846
\$75,000-100,000	1,529	3,898	1,034	326	276	7,063
\$100,000-125,000	1,052	2,807	1,084	488	189	5,620
\$125,000-150,000	618	2,020	892	327	78	3,935
\$150,000-200,000	454	2,055	1,195	324	202	4,230
\$200,000+	699	2,846	1,208	636	402	5,791
Total	17,059	24,147	7,406	2,721	1,517	52,850

Owner Households						
All Age Groups						
Year 2018 Estimates						
	1-Person Household	2-Person Household	3-Person Household	4-Person Household	5+-Person Household	Total
\$0-10,000	1,270	617	192	98	150	2,327
\$10,000-20,000	2,540	706	184	95	68	3,593
\$20,000-30,000	3,251	1,578	528	231	344	5,932
\$30,000-40,000	2,327	2,280	519	243	389	5,758
\$40,000-50,000	2,430	2,187	686	477	530	6,310
\$50,000-60,000	1,651	2,001	703	459	594	5,408
\$60,000-75,000	2,379	3,155	1,245	1,038	543	8,360
\$75,000-100,000	2,618	5,351	2,593	1,740	1,055	13,357
\$100,000-125,000	1,602	4,107	2,562	2,398	1,242	11,911
\$125,000-150,000	828	3,169	2,033	2,107	1,174	9,311
\$150,000-200,000	645	3,333	2,413	2,600	1,999	10,990
\$200,000+	1,215	4,070	2,909	3,274	1,959	13,427
Total	22,756	32,554	16,567	14,760	10,047	96,684



HISTA 2.2 Summary Data

Arlington Heights, IL PMA

© 2018 All rights reserved

Powered by Claritas

Percent Owner Households						
Age 15 to 54 Years						
Year 2018 Estimates						
	1-Person Household	2-Person Household	3-Person Household	4-Person Household	5+-Person Household	Total
\$0-10,000	0.8%	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%	0.2%	1.5%
\$10,000-20,000	0.5%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.1%	1.1%
\$20,000-30,000	0.7%	0.3%	0.7%	0.3%	0.7%	2.7%
\$30,000-40,000	0.8%	0.5%	0.5%	0.4%	0.8%	3.1%
\$40,000-50,000	1.6%	0.9%	1.0%	0.9%	1.0%	5.3%
\$50,000-60,000	0.9%	0.8%	0.7%	0.8%	1.2%	4.5%
\$60,000-75,000	1.8%	1.6%	1.5%	1.9%	1.1%	8.0%
\$75,000-100,000	2.5%	3.3%	3.6%	3.2%	1.8%	14.4%
\$100,000-125,000	1.3%	3.0%	3.4%	4.4%	2.4%	14.4%
\$125,000-150,000	0.5%	2.6%	2.6%	4.1%	2.5%	12.3%
\$150,000-200,000	0.4%	2.9%	2.8%	5.2%	4.1%	15.4%
\$200,000+	1.2%	2.8%	3.9%	6.0%	3.6%	17.4%
Total	13.0%	19.2%	20.9%	27.5%	19.5%	100.0%

Percent Owner Households						
Aged 55+ Years						
Year 2018 Estimates						
	1-Person Household	2-Person Household	3-Person Household	4-Person Household	5+-Person Household	Total
\$0-10,000	1.7%	1.0%	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%	3.2%
\$10,000-20,000	4.4%	1.1%	0.2%	0.1%	0.0%	5.9%
\$20,000-30,000	5.6%	2.8%	0.5%	0.2%	0.1%	9.0%
\$30,000-40,000	3.7%	3.9%	0.6%	0.1%	0.1%	8.3%
\$40,000-50,000	3.3%	3.4%	0.5%	0.2%	0.2%	7.6%
\$50,000-60,000	2.4%	3.1%	0.7%	0.2%	0.2%	6.5%
\$60,000-75,000	3.0%	4.6%	1.1%	0.4%	0.1%	9.2%
\$75,000-100,000	2.9%	7.4%	2.0%	0.6%	0.5%	13.4%
\$100,000-125,000	2.0%	5.3%	2.1%	0.9%	0.4%	10.6%
\$125,000-150,000	1.2%	3.8%	1.7%	0.6%	0.1%	7.4%
\$150,000-200,000	0.9%	3.9%	2.3%	0.6%	0.4%	8.0%
\$200,000+	1.3%	5.4%	2.3%	1.2%	0.8%	11.0%
Total	32.3%	45.7%	14.0%	5.1%	2.9%	100.0%

Percent Owner Households						
All Age Groups						
Year 2018 Estimates						
	1-Person Household	2-Person Household	3-Person Household	4-Person Household	5+-Person Household	Total
\$0-10,000	1.3%	0.6%	0.2%	0.1%	0.2%	2.4%
\$10,000-20,000	2.6%	0.7%	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%	3.7%
\$20,000-30,000	3.4%	1.6%	0.5%	0.2%	0.4%	6.1%
\$30,000-40,000	2.4%	2.4%	0.5%	0.3%	0.4%	6.0%
\$40,000-50,000	2.5%	2.3%	0.7%	0.5%	0.5%	6.5%
\$50,000-60,000	1.7%	2.1%	0.7%	0.5%	0.6%	5.6%
\$60,000-75,000	2.5%	3.3%	1.3%	1.1%	0.6%	8.6%
\$75,000-100,000	2.7%	5.5%	2.7%	1.8%	1.1%	13.8%
\$100,000-125,000	1.7%	4.2%	2.6%	2.5%	1.3%	12.3%
\$125,000-150,000	0.9%	3.3%	2.1%	2.2%	1.2%	9.6%
\$150,000-200,000	0.7%	3.4%	2.5%	2.7%	2.1%	11.4%
\$200,000+	1.3%	4.2%	3.0%	3.4%	2.0%	13.9%
Total	23.5%	33.7%	17.1%	15.3%	10.4%	100.0%

There is a large component of small households in the area, which is the target market for multi-family housing. According to Ribbon Demographics, single person households comprise about 42% of the renter households and 23.5% of the owner households within a five mile radius of the subject property, with two person households comprising another 25% of the renter households and 34% of the owner households within the five mile radius. Thus, the one and two person households comprise 67% of the renter households and 57% of the owner households in this market area.

According to the Ribbon Demographics statistics, one and two person renter households with incomes over \$60,000 total 10,876 households, or approximately 30% of all renter households. One and two person owner households with incomes over \$60,000 total 32,472 household, or approximately 33.5% of all owner households. As already discussed, the subject property will draw prospective renters from an area that is much wider than these geographic boundaries. Additional renter demand will be generated from persons from outside the area due to job relocations or other reasons.

Qualifying Income

Our recommendations for the subject units result in average monthly rents as shown below, along with the minimum income to qualify, utilizing a 30% to 35% rent/income ratio:

	Studio	1BR	1BR+Den	2BR	2BR+Den
Monthly Rent	\$1,550	\$1,850	\$2,150	\$2,400	\$2,600
12 months	12	12	12	12	12
Annual Rent	\$18,600	\$22,200	\$25,800	\$28,800	\$31,200
Rent/Income Ratio	30%	30%	30%	30%	30%
Minimum Income	\$62,000	\$74,000	\$86,000	\$96,000	\$104,000

	Studio	1BR	1BR+Den	2BR	2BR+Den
Monthly Rent	\$1,550	\$1,850	\$2,150	\$2,400	\$2,600
12 months	12	12	12	12	12
Annual Rent	\$18,600	\$22,200	\$25,800	\$28,800	\$31,200
Rent/Income Ratio	35%	35%	35%	35%	35%
Minimum Income	\$53,143	\$63,429	\$73,714	\$82,286	\$89,143

Residents living within a five -mile radius of the subject property have a median household income of \$87,102. With 10,876 one and two person renter households within the subject's market area with income over \$60,000 as a primary target market along with 23,185 one and two person owner households with \$60,000+ incomes who may wish to downsize into rental apartments, the subject property will have a large pool of income-qualified residents within a five mile ring who may wish to move to the subject property. With 361 units, the subject property would need to capture a very small share of this target market. In reality, the property will be drawing from a larger radius than quoted herein, which would reduce the required capture rate even further.

Rental Competition Survey

Existing Competition


Due to the lack of new construction, large-scale rental apartment buildings in downtown Arlington Heights, the competition for the subject units will be located in a broader market area and therefore our market survey includes 16 properties with nearly 3,600 units. As a new construction development, the subject buildings will be competing with other properties which were built within the past several years and which are located in surrounding communities along with older properties in its immediate area. Of particular importance are apartment buildings located in suburban downtowns; however, with the limited number of such projects, we have also included developments in non-suburban downtown locations.

The buildings in the competitive survey are currently reporting rents ranging from \$1.51 to \$2.49 PSF with average unit sizes ranging from 849 to 1,397 SF. Parking prices are ranging from \$60 to \$175 per month. The following is a summary of this survey data followed by a discussion of the buildings which comprise the primary and secondary competition for the subject property.

Apartment Competition Survey – By Unit Type

Unit Type	No. Units	%	Avg SF	Avg Quoted Rent Per Unit	Avg Quoted Rent PSF	Avg Net Effective Rent Per Unit	Avg Net Effective Rent PSF
Studio	199	6%	608	\$1,466	\$2.41	\$1,427	\$2.35
1BR	1,668	46%	793	\$1,800	\$2.27	\$1,722	\$2.17
1BR+Den	222	6%	946	\$1,999	\$2.11	\$1,951	\$2.06
2BR	1,252	35%	1,192	\$2,412	\$2.02	\$2,285	\$1.92
2BR+Den	117	3%	1,402	\$2,799	\$2.00	\$2,531	\$1.81
3BR	130	4%	1,738	\$3,331	\$1.92	\$3,000	\$1.73
Total	3,588	100%	986	\$2,095	\$2.13	\$1,989	\$2.02

**Rent Summary - Avg Net Effective Rent PSF &
Avg Unit Size (SF)**



One Arlington, Dunton Tower and Hancock Square are located in Arlington Heights. Dunton Tower and Hancock Square are located close to the subject property within downtown Arlington Heights and offer locations very similar to the subject property. Both properties are within walking distance of the Metra station as well as shops and restaurants, like the subject property. The units have been updated with granite and some wood-look flooring in the kitchens but Dunton Tower lacks in-unit washers and dryers which are now standard in new construction projects. Both properties are high-rise elevator buildings. While these properties have updated finishes, they are not new construction and therefore are not able to command the new construction rent premiums. Also in downtown Arlington Heights is **Parkview**, a small rental building which was recently constructed and leased up. Its total unit count was only 45 units including an affordable component.

One Arlington is located next to the Arlington International Racecourse and just east of Route 53. It is northwest of the downtown area and part of the Arlington Downs master planned development. The property was originally built as a hotel in 1969 and had been vacant since 2009. The conversion of the hotel building was completed in 2014 and the former water slide park is now being renovated into First Ascent/Funtopia, a climbing wall/fitness/entertainment complex. As a future phase, there will be retail, hotel, restaurants, and additional multifamily units developed on adjoining sites. The location is within walking distance to a Metra station but not within the downtown area. The finishes are consistent with the Class A new construction rental product. This 12-story building offers excellent views and extensive amenities including a roof top sundeck, clubroom, fitness center, along with other amenities such as a golf driving range.

North680 is the newest addition to the rental market in Schaumburg. This development began delivering units in 2017 and is stabilized. It has a suburban location on Algonquin Road, west of Route 53. Thus, it lacks the suburban downtown location which the subject property offers. Des Plaines has two existing rental apartment buildings located in its downtown area which could be alternatives to the subject property: **Kingston Pointe** and **River 595** were originally designed and constructed as condominium buildings but delivered in the recession and were converted to rental

utilization. Both buildings have similar locations in the downtown area and are walking distance to shops, restaurants and the Metra station. The unit mix at both of these building is geared toward larger units since the buildings were originally planned to be condominiums. These larger unit sizes result in rents on a per square foot basis at the lower end of the comparable data set. The finishes are typical of new construction alternatives in the market but the amenity package is limited at Kingston Pointe and reflective of the smaller building size at River 595. With the larger average unit sizes, inferior amenities, and a less vibrant downtown ambience, these rents will fall below the levels indicated for the subject units.

Buckingham Place is the newest addition to the Des Plaines market. Situated on Northwest Highway close to a mile outside of the downtown area, this 267-unit property began offering occupancy in mid-August, with construction still underway. It is a wrap-style elevator property offering amenities similar to other new properties in the market. Its location is within walking distance of a secondary Metra station in Des Plaines but it lacks the subject property's proximity to downtown-type retail and restaurant amenities. Thus, its rent levels fall below what would be indicated for the subject property.

There are four developments located in Glenview which were included in the survey. Three of these developments were built within the last couple years. Of these properties, only **Midtown Square** is located in walking distance to both the Metra and downtown retail and restaurants; this is reflected in its rent levels which surpass its Glenview competition on a rent per square foot basis. **The Reserve** is adjacent to the Golf Metra station and a Mariano's anchored shopping center but lacks the walkable downtown location that many renters now desire. **Tapestry** is situated in a retail center also anchored by Mariano's, overlooking I-294 at the four-way interchange with Willow Road. This location lacks a suburban ambience but provides excellent auto access to the metropolitan area.

Aloft at Glen Town Center is part of the larger planned development known as The Glen Town Center. The location is within walking proximity to many retail and restaurants amenities but is a longer "hike" to the Glen/North Glenview Metra station. Completed in 2004, Aloft lacks the newest design features seen in the newer buildings.

Park 205 has an excellent location in downtown Park Ridge adjacent to a Whole Foods and within walking distance of the Metra station. With only 115 units, Park 205 offers a swimming pool, club room and fitness center and has been able to generate strong rents. With its downtown location, proximity to Metra, and lack of comparable competing units in its downtown area, Park 205 is generating rents at the top end of the survey properties.

Northgate Crossing is located in Wheeling, just north of Dundee Road. It is a heavily car dependent, suburban location. While it is within walking distance of a Metra station, the Metra service to this station is not as frequent as at the Arlington Heights station. This development includes several buildings with garages built into the first floor. Some of the units include attached garages while others require tenants to exit the unit in order to access the garage. This provides for private garages but can be less desirable if a tenant has to walk outside to access the garage. The amenities are located in a separate clubhouse rather than attached to the building. Give the location in Wheeling and the inferior building design, the rents are considered to fall below what would be achievable at the subject.

The Residences at Hamilton Lakes in Itasca was also included at the southern edge of the survey. Unlike the subject property, it is located in an office park rather than a suburban downtown and would likely not provide primary competition. Two other 2018 deliveries to the market were also included in the survey to reflect the current development trends in the area. **Deer Park Crossing** is a 236 unit development in Deer Park, a Lake County community to the north. In general, its unit sizes are larger and its average unit size is skewed upward by its significant townhouse component. While not in a suburban downtown, it is situated within a larger planned mixed-use development which includes extensive retail and restaurant amenities. However, as a non-downtown location, it lacks subject's walkability and Metra proximity. **444 Social** in Lincolnshire also is engaged in lease-up, with occupancy starting in the fall. This property also has proximity to other retail/restaurant amenities but lacks the walkability and Metra proximity of the subject location.

Future Competition

Although the Northwest Cook submarket has had very few new deliveries in the past 20 years, developers have become increasingly interested in this submarket. At the present time, there are four projects under construction ranging from a 73 unit development in downtown Mount Prospect to 301 units which are being developed in a mixed-use development in Wheeling. In addition, there are numerous projects which are being proposed but which have not yet broken ground. Thus, the timing and actual construction of these other proposed deals is still uncertain.



In July 2018, Arlington Heights trustees approved the plans for a five story, 76 units apartment building which will be developed east of the downtown area at the northwest corner of Kensington Road and Hickory Avenue. This project, being developed by Guido Neri, will contain a mix of studio, one bedroom, and two bedroom units.

To summarize, these are the projects which are being proposed or currently under construction in the Northwest Cook submarket:

© 2018 Integra Realty Resources - Chicago

Under Construction / Planning

Property	Submarket	City	Developer	Status	Units
Northshore					
Northwest Cook County					
One Apts/Wheeling Town Center	Cook NW	Wheeling	Lynmark/Urban R2	Construction	301
Uptown 500/501 W Dundee	Cook NW	Wheeling	DAC/Atlas	Planning	321
Buckingham Place/Littelfuse site/800 E NW Hwy	Cook NW	Des Plaines	Dearborn-Buckingham	Construction	270
Sim's Bowl site/1555-65 Ellinwood	Cook NW	Des Plaines	Opus/Bersshire	Construction	113
Covington Lexington Woods/Golf & E River Rd	Cook NW	Des Plaines	Lexington	Construction	236
Ellinwood Apts/SEC Ellinwood & Graceland	Cook NW	Des Plaines	Bayview-Compasspoint	Planning	212
20West/20 W Northwest Hwy	Cook NW	Mt Prospect	Nicholas & Assoc	Construction	73
Maple St Lofts/215-225 E Prospect	Cook NW	Mt Prospect	Nicholas & Assoc	Planning	300
Veridian/Motorola site	Cook NW	Schaumburg	UrbanStreet	Planning	TBD
Plum Farms/NWC Rts 59 & 72	Cook NW	Hoffman Estates	Iatarola	Planning	253
AT&T Campus/Hoffman Estates	Cook NW	Hoffman Estates	Somerset	Planning	379
NWC Lake & Church	Cook NW	Hanover Park	Monroe Residential	Planning	131
Hickory Apartments, NWC Hickory & Kensington	Cook NW	Arlington Heights	Neri	Planning	76
Arlington Downs - multiple phases	Cook NW	Arlington Heights	Springbank/Trandel	Planning	263
Arlington Downs - multiple phases	Cook NW	Arlington Heights	Springbank/Trandel	Planning	360
Northwest Hwy & Walnut	Cook NW	Arlington Heights	Brian Properties	Planning	106


Of these projects which are currently under construction, subject's downtown Arlington Heights location is expected to command a premium which will be reflected in its rents and lease-up.

Market Survey Details

On the following pages is a summary of the market survey along with the individual project summary sheets for each development.

Rental Competition Summary and Details

Apartment Competition Map



Apartment Rental Competition Overview

© 2018 Integra Realty Resources - Chicago, All Rights Reserved

Name	Address	Suburb	Total Units	Class	Date Built	Avg Size (SF)	Quoted Rent PSF	Net Rent PSF	Garage Fee	Occup.
Subject - Campbell		Arlington Heights	182	A	Proposed	793				
Subject - Highland		Arlington Heights	125	A	Proposed	819				
Subject - Chestnut		Arlington Heights	54	A	Proposed	1,063				
Subject - Total			361			842				
Dunton Tower	55 South Vail	Arlington Heights	216	B	1986	902	\$1.92	\$1.92	\$75	98.1%
Hancock Square	200 North Arlington Hts Rd	Arlington Heights	409	B	1988	849	\$2.34	\$2.34	\$75	96.3%
One Arlington	3400 W. Stonegate Blvd	Arlington Heights	214	A	2014	936	\$2.08	\$2.08	\$75	93.9%
North680	680 E. Algonquin Rd.	Schaumburg	180	A	2017	894	\$2.21	\$2.21	\$75 - \$120	87.8%
Buckingham Place	750 E. Northwest Hwy	Des Plaines	267	A	2018	961	\$1.94	\$1.84	\$75	In lease up
River 595	595 S. River Rd	Des Plaines	60	A	2011	1,397	\$1.63	\$1.51	\$100	93.3%
Kingston Pointe	1646 River St	Des Plaines	144	A	2009	1,203	\$1.79	\$1.79	\$50 - \$100	91.7%
Tapestry Glenview	2550 Waterview Dr	Glenview	290	A	2014	887	\$2.18	\$2.09	\$60	99.0%
Aloft at Glen Town Center	1991 Tower Drive	Glenview	181	A	2004	1,141	\$2.05	\$1.88	\$75 - \$125	89.5%
Midtown Square	998 Church St	Glenview	138	A	2014	920	\$2.40	\$2.25	\$135	94.9%
Reserve at Glenview	195 N. Waukegan Rd	Glenview	239	A	2015	1,013	\$2.28	\$2.19	\$75 - \$125	89.5%
Northgate Crossing	250 Northgate Pkwy	Wheeling	300	A	2016	969	\$1.83	\$1.62	\$145 - \$175	87.7%
Park 205	205 W. Touhy	Park Ridge	115	A	2015	975	\$2.49	\$2.49	\$125 - \$200	96.5%
The Res. At Hamilton Lakes	1133 N. Arlington Heights	Itasca	297	A	2015	934	\$2.24	\$2.21	\$125	In lease up
444 Social	444 Parkway Drive	Lincolnshire	302	A	2018	953	\$2.42	\$2.12	\$75 - \$150	In lease up
Deer Park Crossing	21599 W. Field Ct.	Deer Park	236	A	2018	1,350	\$1.98	\$1.70	\$150	In lease up
Total			3,588							

Apartment Rental Competition Unit Mix (Number of Units & Percentage)

© 2018 Integra Realty Resources - Chicago, All Rights Reserved


Name	Address	Suburb	Total Units	Class	Date Built	Avg Size (SF)	Studio		1BR		1BR+Den		2BR		2BR+Den		3BR	
							Units	%	Units	%	Units	%	Units	%	Units	%	Units	%
Subject - Campbell		Arlington Heights	182	A	Proposed	793	42	23%	77	42%	21	12%	42	23%		0%		
Subject - Highland		Arlington Heights	125	A	Proposed	819	41	33%	60	48%			24	19%				
Subject - Chestnut		Arlington Heights	54	A	Proposed	1,063	4	7%	12	22%	8	15%	22	41%	8	15%		
Subject - Total			361			842	87	24%	149	41%	29	8%	88	24%	8	2%		
Dunton Tower	55 South Vail	Arlington Heights	216	B	1986	902	27	12%	108	50%			81	38%				
Hancock Square	200 North Arlington Hts Rd	Arlington Heights	409	B	1988	849	30	7%	143	35%	89	22%	147	36%				
One Arlington	3400 W. Stonegate Blvd	Arlington Heights	214	A	2014	936	51	24%	113	53%			50	23%				
North680	680 E. Algonquin Rd.	Schaumburg	180	A	2017	894			104	58%	24	13%	52	29%				
Buckingham Place	750 E. Northwest Hwy	Des Plaines	267	A	2018	961	19	7%	130	49%			113	42%			5	2%
River 595	595 S. River Rd	Des Plaines	60	A	2011	1,397			5	8%			5	8%	50	83%		
Kingston Pointe	1646 River St	Des Plaines	144	A	2009	1,203			34	24%	28	19%	72	50%	7	5%	3	2%
Tapestry Glenview	2550 Waterview Dr	Glenview	290	A	2014	887	29	10%	136	47%	12	4%	113	39%				
Aloft at Glen Town Center	1991 Tower Drive	Glenview	181	A	2004	1,141			81	45%	8	4%	90	50%	2	1%		
Midtown Square	998 Church St	Glenview	138	A	2014	920			99	72%			39	28%				
Reserve at Glenview	195 N. Waukegan Rd	Glenview	239	A	2015	1,013	6	3%	103	43%	18	8%	76	32%			36	15%
Northgate Crossing	250 Northgate Pkwy	Wheeling	300	A	2016	969			162	54%	20	7%	106	35%			12	4%
Park 205	205 W. Touhy	Park Ridge	115	A	2015	975			57	50%	7	6%	45	39%	3	3%	3	3%
The Res. At Hamilton Lakes	1133 N. Arlington Heights	Itasca	297	A	2015	934	3	1.00%	186	63%			96	32%			12	4%
444 Social	444 Parkway Drive	Lincolnshire	302	A	2018	953	34	11%	111	37%	16	5%	71	24%	55	18%	15	5%
Deer Park Crossing	21599 W. Field Ct.	Deer Park	236	A	2018	1,350			96	41%			96	41%			44	19%
Total			3,588				199	6%	1,668	46%	222	6%	1,252	35%	117	3%	130	4%

Apartment Rental Competition Unit Sizes – Square Footage Range

© 2018 Integra Realty Resources - Chicago, All Rights Reserved

Name	Address	Suburb	Total Units	Class	Date Built	Avg Size (SF)	Studio SF	1BR SF	1BR+Den SF	2BR SF	2BR+Den SF	3BR SF
Subject - Campbell		Arlington Heights	182	A	Proposed	793	512 - 552	679 - 853	974 - 990	914 - 1,127		
Subject - Highland		Arlington Heights	125	A	Proposed	819	524 - 785	659 - 1,088		1,035 - 1,170		
Subject - Chestnut		Arlington Heights	54	A	Proposed	1,063	515	815 - 827	976 - 1,162	8,899 - 1,352	1,249 - 1,364	
Subject - Total			361			842						
Dunton Tower	55 South Vail	Arlington Heights	216	B	1986	902	600	785 - 800		1,100 - 1,200		
Hancock Square	200 North Arlington Hts Rd	Arlington Heights	409	B	1988	849	608	677	850 - 925	975 - 1,128		
One Arlington	3400 W. Stonegate Blvd	Arlington Heights	214	A	2014	936	549 - 769	803 - 1012		1,193 - 1,521		
North680	680 E. Algonquin Rd.	Schaumburg	180	A	2017	894		665 - 785	1,039	1,130 - 1,588		
Buckingham Place	750 E. Northwest Hwy	Des Plaines	267	A	2018	961	603	743 - 960		951 - 1,271		1,786
River 595	595 S. River Rd	Des Plaines	60	A	2011	1,397		860		1,325	1,390 - 1,660	
Kingston Pointe	1646 River St	Des Plaines	144	A	2009	1,203		820 - 1005	971 - 1,089	1,207 - 1,448	1,769	1,725 - 1,924
Tapestry Glenview	2550 Waterview Dr	Glenview	290	A	2014	887	599	715 - 822	1,019	1,064 - 1,212		
Aloft at Glen Town Center	1991 Tower Drive	Glenview	181	A	2004	1,141		775 - 1000	1,050 - 1,325	1,100 - 1,600	1,800	
Midtown Square	998 Church St	Glenview	138	A	2014	920		763 - 909		923 - 1,341		
Reserve at Glenview	195 N. Waukegan Rd	Glenview	239	A	2015	1,013	630	750 - 810	964	1,105 - 1,271		1,385 - 1,407
Northgate Crossing	250 Northgate Pkwy	Wheeling	300	A	2016	969		696 - 873	883	1,190 - 1,212		1,971 - 2005
Park 205	205 W. Touhy	Park Ridge	115	A	2015	975		606 - 881	942 - 1,064	1,080 - 1,345	1,316	1,387 - 1423
The Res. At Hamilton Lakes	1133 N. Arlington Heights	Itasca	297	A	2015	934	472	655 - 859		1,146 - 1,299		1,480
444 Social	444 Parkway Drive	Lincolnshire	302	A	2018	953	475 - 636	698 - 822	841 - 847	940 - 1,224	1,137	1,397 - 1,544
Deer Park Crossing	21599 W. Field Ct.	Deer Park	236	A	2018	1,350		806 - 927		1,312 - 1,647		1,965 - 2,283
Total			3,588									

Market Survey Summary



Rent Survey Summary and Detailed Project Summary Sheets

On the following pages are the summaries of the current rents for the competing properties.

Studio/Convertible Apartment Comparables

Unit Description	Units	Pct	Sq Ft	Quoted Rent			Concession	Net Effective Rent		
				Rent	PSF	Avg		Rent	PSF	Avg
444 Social										
Studio	34	11.3%	475	\$1,300	\$2.74	\$2.61	12.5%	\$1,138	\$2.39	\$2.28
1.0 Bath			636	\$1,575	\$2.48			\$1,378	\$2.17	
Buckingham Place										
Studio	19	7.1%	603	\$1,437	\$2.38	\$2.40	5.6%	\$1,357	\$2.25	\$2.26
1.0 Bath			603	\$1,452	\$2.41			\$1,371	\$2.27	
Dunton Tower										
Studio	27	12.5%	600	\$1,270	\$2.12	\$2.13	0.0%	\$1,270	\$2.12	\$2.13
1.0 Bath			600	\$1,289	\$2.15			\$1,289	\$2.15	
Hancock Square At Arlington Station										
Studio	30	7.3%	608	\$1,358	\$2.23	\$2.41	0.0%	\$1,358	\$2.23	\$2.41
1.0 Bath			608	\$1,570	\$2.58			\$1,570	\$2.58	
One Arlington										
Studio	51	23.8%	549	\$1,449	\$2.64	\$2.33	0.0%	\$1,449	\$2.64	\$2.33
1.0 Bath			769	\$1,549	\$2.01			\$1,549	\$2.01	
Reserve at Glenview										
Studio	6	2.5%	630	\$1,650	\$2.62	\$2.62	0.0%	\$1,650	\$2.62	\$2.62
1.0 Bath			630	\$1,650	\$2.62			\$1,650	\$2.62	
Tapestry Glenview										
Studio	29	10.0%	599	\$1,499	\$2.50	\$2.56	0.0%	\$1,499	\$2.50	\$2.56
1.0 Bath			599	\$1,569	\$2.62			\$1,569	\$2.62	
The Residences at Hamilton Lakes										
Studio	3	1.0%	472	\$1,340	\$2.84	\$2.84	0.0%	\$1,340	\$2.84	\$2.84
1.0 Bath			472	\$1,340	\$2.84			\$1,340	\$2.84	
Total/Weighted Avg	199		608	\$1,466		\$2.41		\$1,427		\$2.35

One Bedroom Apartment Comparables

Unit Description	Units	Pct	Sq Ft	Quoted Rent			Concession	Net Effective Rent		
				Rent	PSF	Avg		Rent	PSF	Avg
444 Social										
One Bedroom	88	29.1%	698	\$1,665	\$2.39	\$2.39	12.5%	\$1,457	\$2.09	\$2.09
1.0 Bath			811	\$1,940	\$2.39			\$1,698	\$2.09	
444 Social										
One Bedroom	23	7.6%	822	\$1,945	\$2.37	\$2.38	12.5%	\$1,702	\$2.07	\$2.08
1.0 Bath			822	\$1,970	\$2.40			\$1,724	\$2.10	
Aloft at Glen Town Center										
One Bedroom	81	44.8%	775	\$1,600	\$2.06	\$2.21	8.3%	\$1,467	\$1.89	\$2.02
1.0 Bath			1,000	\$2,350	\$2.35			\$2,154	\$2.15	
Buckingham Place										
One Bedroom	130	48.7%	743	\$1,661	\$2.24	\$2.05	5.6%	\$1,569	\$2.11	\$1.93
1.0 Bath			960	\$1,783	\$1.86			\$1,684	\$1.75	
Deer Park Crossing										
One Bedroom	96	40.7%	806	\$1,699	\$2.11	\$2.30	14.3%	\$1,456	\$1.81	\$1.97
1.0 Bath			927	\$2,307	\$2.49			\$1,977	\$2.13	
Dunton Tower										
One Bedroom	108	50.0%	785	\$1,639	\$2.09	\$2.14	0.0%	\$1,639	\$2.09	\$2.14
1.0 Bath			800	\$1,754	\$2.19			\$1,754	\$2.19	
Hancock Square At Arlington Station										
One Bedroom	143	35.0%	677	\$1,682	\$2.48	\$2.56	0.0%	\$1,682	\$2.48	\$2.56
1.0 Bath			677	\$1,781	\$2.63			\$1,781	\$2.63	
Kingston Pointe										
One Bedroom	34	23.6%	820	\$1,625	\$1.98	\$1.90	0.0%	\$1,625	\$1.98	\$1.90
1.0 Bath			1,005	\$1,835	\$1.83			\$1,835	\$1.83	
Midtown Square										
One Bedroom	99	71.7%	763	\$1,758	\$2.30	\$2.42	6.2%	\$1,650	\$2.16	\$2.27
1.0 Bath			909	\$2,304	\$2.53			\$2,162	\$2.38	
North680										
One Bedroom	104	57.8%	665	\$1,629	\$2.45	\$2.42	0.0%	\$1,629	\$2.45	\$2.42
1.0 Bath			785	\$1,869	\$2.38			\$1,869	\$2.38	
Northgate Crossing										
One Bedroom	162	54.0%	696	\$1,535	\$2.21	\$2.12	11.5%	\$1,358	\$1.95	\$1.87
1.0 Bath			873	\$1,770	\$2.03			\$1,566	\$1.79	
One Arlington										
One Bedroom	113	52.8%	803	\$1,599	\$1.99	\$1.97	0.0%	\$1,599	\$1.99	\$1.97
1.0 Bath			1,012	\$1,965	\$1.94			\$1,965	\$1.94	
Park 205 Apartments										
One Bedroom	57	49.6%	606	\$1,725	\$2.85	\$2.56	0.0%	\$1,725	\$2.85	\$2.56
1.0 Bath			881	\$2,000	\$2.27			\$2,000	\$2.27	
Reserve at Glenview										
One Bedroom	103	43.1%	750	\$1,800	\$2.40	\$2.40	2.2%	\$1,760	\$2.35	\$2.35
1.0 Bath			810	\$1,950	\$2.41			\$1,907	\$2.35	

One Bedroom Apartment Comparables Continued

Unit Description	Units	Pct	Sq Ft	Quoted Rent			Concession	Net Effective Rent		
				Rent	PSF	Avg		Rent	PSF	Avg
River 595										
One Bedroom	5	8.3%	860	\$1,829	\$2.13	\$2.18	7.7%	\$1,688	\$1.96	\$2.02
1.0 Bath			860	\$1,929	\$2.24			\$1,781	\$2.07	
Tapestry Glenview										
One Bedroom	80	27.6%	715	\$1,699	\$2.38	\$2.38	0.0%	\$1,699	\$2.38	\$2.38
1.0 Bath			715	\$1,699	\$2.38			\$1,699	\$2.38	
Tapestry Glenview										
One Bedroom	56	19.3%	822	\$1,810	\$2.20	\$2.20	0.0%	\$1,810	\$2.20	\$2.20
1.0 Bath			822	\$1,810	\$2.20			\$1,810	\$2.20	
The Residences at Hamilton Lakes										
One Bedroom	186	62.6%	655	\$1,530	\$2.34	\$2.36	1.4%	\$1,509	\$2.30	\$2.33
1.0 Bath			859	\$2,045	\$2.38			\$2,016	\$2.35	
Total/Weighted Avg	1,668		793	\$1,800		\$2.27		\$1,722		\$2.17

One Bedroom +Den Apartment Comparables

Unit Description	Units	Pct	Sq Ft	Quoted Rent			Concession	Net Effective Rent		
				Rent	PSF	Avg		Rent	PSF	Avg
444 Social										
One Bedroom + Den	16	5.3%	841	\$2,025	\$2.41	\$2.42	12.5%	\$1,772	\$2.11	\$2.12
1.0 Bath			847	\$2,060	\$2.43			\$1,803	\$2.13	
Aloft at Glen Town Center										
One Bedroom + Den	8	4.4%	1,050	\$2,350	\$2.24	\$2.07	8.3%	\$2,154	\$2.05	\$1.90
1.0-2.0 Bath			1,325	\$2,520	\$1.90			\$2,310	\$1.74	
Hancock Square At Arlington Station										
One Bedroom + Den	89	21.8%	850	\$1,869	\$2.20	\$2.16	0.0%	\$1,869	\$2.20	\$2.16
1.0 Bath			925	\$1,964	\$2.12			\$1,964	\$2.12	
Kingston Pointe										
One Bedroom + Den	28	19.4%	971	\$1,847	\$1.90	\$1.85	0.0%	\$1,847	\$1.90	\$1.85
1.0 Bath			1,089	\$1,950	\$1.79			\$1,950	\$1.79	
North680										
One Bedroom + Den	24	13.3%	1,039	\$2,119	\$2.04	\$2.10	0.0%	\$2,119	\$2.04	\$2.10
1.0 Bath			1,039	\$2,250	\$2.17			\$2,250	\$2.17	
Northgate Crossing										
One Bedroom + Den	20	6.7%	883	\$1,750	\$1.98	\$2.01	11.5%	\$1,548	\$1.75	\$1.78
1.0 Bath			883	\$1,800	\$2.04			\$1,592	\$1.80	
Park 205 Apartments										
One Bedroom + Den	7	6.1%	942	\$2,360	\$2.51	\$2.38	0.0%	\$2,360	\$2.51	\$2.38
1.0 Bath			1,064	\$2,400	\$2.26			\$2,400	\$2.26	
Reserve at Glenview										
One Bedroom + Den	18	7.5%	964	\$2,080	\$2.16	\$2.20	2.0%	\$2,039	\$2.12	\$2.16
1.0 Bath			964	\$2,160	\$2.24			\$2,118	\$2.20	
Tapestry Glenview										
One Bedroom + Den	12	4.1%	1,019	\$2,049	\$2.01	\$2.01	0.0%	\$2,049	\$2.01	\$2.01
1.0 Bath			1,019	\$2,049	\$2.01			\$2,049	\$2.01	
Total/Weighted Avg	222		946	\$1,999		\$2.11		\$1,951		\$2.06

Two Bedroom Apartment Comparables

Unit Description	Units	Pct	Sq Ft	Quoted Rent			Concession	Net Effective Rent		
				Rent	PSF	Avg		Rent	PSF	Avg
444 Social										
Two Bedroom	71	23.5%	940	\$2,260	\$2.40	\$2.42	12.5%	\$1,978	\$2.10	\$2.11
1.0-2.0 Bath			1,224	\$2,970	\$2.43			\$2,599	\$2.12	
Aloft at Glen Town Center										
Two Bedroom	90	49.7%	1,100	\$2,155	\$1.96	\$1.95	8.3%	\$1,975	\$1.80	\$1.78
2.0 Bath			1,600	\$3,090	\$1.93			\$2,833	\$1.77	
Buckingham Place										
Two Bedroom	113	42.3%	951	\$1,916	\$2.01	\$1.88	5.6%	\$1,810	\$1.90	\$1.78
2.0 Bath			1,271	\$2,220	\$1.75			\$2,097	\$1.65	
Deer Park Crossing										
Two Bedroom	96	40.7%	1,312	\$2,569	\$1.96	\$1.93	14.3%	\$2,202	\$1.68	\$1.65
2.0 Bath			1,647	\$3,127	\$1.90			\$2,680	\$1.63	
Dunton Tower										
Two Bedroom	81	37.5%	1,100	\$1,854	\$1.69	\$1.68	0.0%	\$1,854	\$1.69	\$1.68
2.0 Bath			1,200	\$1,999	\$1.67			\$1,999	\$1.67	
Hancock Square At Arlington Station										
Two Bedroom	87	21.3%	975	\$2,227	\$2.28	\$2.32	0.0%	\$2,227	\$2.28	\$2.32
2.0 Bath			991	\$2,343	\$2.36			\$2,343	\$2.36	
Hancock Square At Arlington Station										
Two Bedroom	60	14.7%	1,128	\$2,500	\$2.22	\$2.24	0.0%	\$2,500	\$2.22	\$2.24
2.0 Bath			1,128	\$2,546	\$2.26			\$2,546	\$2.26	
Kingston Pointe										
Two Bedroom	72	50.0%	1,207	\$2,099	\$1.74	\$1.78	0.0%	\$2,099	\$1.74	\$1.78
2.0 Bath			1,448	\$2,650	\$1.83			\$2,650	\$1.83	
Midtown Square										
Two Bedroom	39	28.3%	923	\$2,467	\$2.67	\$2.40	6.3%	\$2,312	\$2.51	\$2.25
2.0 Bath			1,341	\$2,843	\$2.12			\$2,665	\$1.99	
North680										
Two Bedroom	48	26.7%	1,130	\$2,229	\$1.97	\$1.99	0.0%	\$2,229	\$1.97	\$1.99
2.0 Bath			1,130	\$2,279	\$2.02			\$2,279	\$2.02	
North680										
Two Bedroom	4	2.2%	1,588	\$3,409	\$2.15	\$2.15	0.0%	\$3,409	\$2.15	\$2.15
2.0 Bath			1,588	\$3,409	\$2.15			\$3,409	\$2.15	
Northgate Crossing										
Two Bedroom	16	5.3%	883	\$1,670	\$1.89	\$1.97	11.5%	\$1,477	\$1.67	\$1.75
1.0 Bath			883	\$1,815	\$2.06			\$1,606	\$1.82	
Northgate Crossing										
Two Bedroom	90	30.0%	1,190	\$1,645	\$1.38	\$1.57	11.5%	\$1,455	\$1.22	\$1.39
2.0 Bath			1,212	\$2,125	\$1.75			\$1,880	\$1.55	

Two Bedroom Apartment Comparables Continued

Unit Description	Units	Pct	Sq Ft	Quoted Rent			Concession	Net Effective Rent		
				Rent	PSF	Avg		Rent	PSF	Avg
One Arlington										
Two Bedroom	36	16.8%	1,193	\$2,499	\$2.09	\$2.10	0.0%	\$2,499	\$2.09	\$2.10
2.0 Bath			1,273	\$2,669	\$2.10			\$2,669	\$2.10	
One Arlington										
Two Bedroom	14	6.5%	1,303	\$3,245	\$2.49	\$2.31	0.0%	\$3,245	\$2.49	\$2.31
2.0 Bath			1,521	\$3,245	\$2.13			\$3,245	\$2.13	
Park 205 Apartments										
Two Bedroom	45	39.1%	1,080	\$2,695	\$2.50	\$2.47	0.0%	\$2,695	\$2.50	\$2.47
2.0 Bath			1,345	\$3,280	\$2.44			\$3,280	\$2.44	
Reserve at Glenview										
Two Bedroom	76	31.8%	1,105	\$2,340	\$2.12	\$2.24	4.7%	\$2,230	\$2.02	\$2.13
2.0 Bath			1,271	\$2,990	\$2.35			\$2,850	\$2.24	
River 595										
Two Bedroom	5	8.3%	1,325	\$2,159	\$1.63	\$1.66	7.7%	\$1,993	\$1.50	\$1.54
2.0 Bath			1,325	\$2,249	\$1.70			\$2,076	\$1.57	
Tapestry Glenview										
Two Bedroom	84	29.0%	1,064	\$2,099	\$1.97	\$1.97	8.3%	\$1,924	\$1.81	\$1.81
2.0 Bath			1,064	\$2,099	\$1.97			\$1,924	\$1.81	
Tapestry Glenview										
Two Bedroom	29	10.0%	1,212	\$2,669	\$2.20	\$2.20	8.3%	\$2,447	\$2.02	\$2.02
2.0 Bath			1,212	\$2,669	\$2.20			\$2,447	\$2.02	
The Residences at Hamilton Lakes										
Two Bedroom	96	32.3%	1,146	\$2,425	\$2.12	\$2.10	1.3%	\$2,393	\$2.09	\$2.07
2.0 Bath			1,299	\$2,705	\$2.08			\$2,670	\$2.06	
Total/Weighted Avg	1,252		1,192	\$2,412		\$2.02		\$2,285		\$1.92

Two Bedroom + Den Apartment Comparables

Unit Description	Units	Pct	Sq Ft	Quoted Rent			Concession	Net Effective Rent		
				Rent	PSF	Avg		Rent	PSF	Avg
444 Social										
Two Bedroom + Den	55	18.2%	1,137	\$2,755	\$2.42	\$2.43	12.5%	\$2,411	\$2.12	\$2.13
2.0 Bath			1,452	\$3,550	\$2.44			\$3,106	\$2.14	
Aloft at Glen Town Center										
Two Bedroom + Den	2	1.1%	1,800	\$3,810	\$2.12	\$2.45	8.3%	\$3,493	\$1.94	\$2.24
2.0 Bath			1,800	\$5,000	\$2.78			\$4,583	\$2.55	
Kingston Pointe										
Two Bedroom + Den	7	4.9%	1,769	\$2,650	\$1.50	\$1.50	0.0%	\$2,650	\$1.50	\$1.50
2.5 Bath			1,769	\$2,650	\$1.50			\$2,650	\$1.50	
Park 205 Apartments										
Two Bedroom + Den	3	2.6%	1,316	\$3,415	\$2.60	\$2.60	0.0%	\$3,415	\$2.60	\$2.60
2.0 Bath			1,316	\$3,415	\$2.60			\$3,415	\$2.60	
River 595										
Two Bedroom + Den	30	50.0%	1,390	\$2,120	\$1.53	\$1.59	7.7%	\$1,957	\$1.41	\$1.47
2.0 Bath			1,390	\$2,300	\$1.65			\$2,123	\$1.53	
River 595										
Two Bedroom + Den	10	16.7%	1,480	\$2,389	\$1.61	\$1.62	7.7%	\$2,205	\$1.49	\$1.49
2.0 Bath			1,480	\$2,400	\$1.62			\$2,215	\$1.50	
River 595										
Two Bedroom + Den	5	8.3%	1,620	\$2,569	\$1.59	\$1.60	7.7%	\$2,371	\$1.46	\$1.48
2.0 Bath			1,620	\$2,609	\$1.61			\$2,408	\$1.49	
River 595										
Two Bedroom + Den	5	8.3%	1,660	\$2,649	\$1.60	\$1.61	7.7%	\$2,445	\$1.47	\$1.48
2.0 Bath			1,660	\$2,689	\$1.62			\$2,482	\$1.50	
Total/Weighted Avg	117		1,402	\$2,799		\$2.00		\$2,531		\$1.81

Three Bedroom Apartment Comparables

Unit Description	Units	Pct	Sq Ft	Quoted Rent			Concession	Net Effective Rent		
				Rent	PSF	Avg		Rent	PSF	Avg
444 Social										
Three Bedroom	15	5.0%	1,397	\$3,385	\$2.42	\$2.41	12.5%	\$2,962	\$2.12	\$2.11
2.0 Bath			1,544	\$3,695	\$2.39			\$3,233	\$2.09	
Buckingham Place										
Three Bedroom	5	1.9%	1,786	\$2,748	\$1.54	\$1.55	5.6%	\$2,595	\$1.45	\$1.47
2.0 Bath			1,786	\$2,798	\$1.57			\$2,643	\$1.48	
Deer Park Crossing										
Three Bedroom	44	18.6%	1,965	\$3,414	\$1.74	\$1.78	14.3%	\$2,926	\$1.49	\$1.53
2.5 Bath			2,283	\$4,160	\$1.82			\$3,566	\$1.56	
Kingston Pointe										
Three Bedroom	3	2.1%	1,725	\$3,142	\$1.82	\$1.73	0.0%	\$3,142	\$1.82	\$1.73
3.0 Bath & up			1,924	\$3,142	\$1.63			\$3,142	\$1.63	
Northgate Crossing										
Three Bedroom	12	4.0%	1,971	\$2,690	\$1.36	\$1.36	11.5%	\$2,380	\$1.21	\$1.21
2.0 Bath			2,005	\$2,730	\$1.36			\$2,415	\$1.20	
Park 205 Apartments										
Three Bedroom	3	2.6%	1,387	\$3,785	\$2.73	\$2.70	0.0%	\$3,785	\$2.73	\$2.70
2.0 Bath			1,423	\$3,795	\$2.67			\$3,795	\$2.67	
Reserve at Glenview										
Three Bedroom	36	15.1%	1,385	\$2,925	\$2.11	\$2.15	6.9%	\$2,722	\$1.97	\$2.00
2.0 Bath			1,407	\$3,085	\$2.19			\$2,871	\$2.04	
The Residences at Hamilton Lakes										
Three Bedroom	12	4.0%	1,480	\$3,175	\$2.15	\$2.15	1.3%	\$3,133	\$2.12	\$2.12
2.0 Bath			1,480	\$3,185	\$2.15			\$3,143	\$2.12	
Total/Weighted Avg	130		1,738	\$3,331		\$1.92		\$3,000		\$1.73


On the following pages are the detailed rent pages for each of the survey properties.

444 Social

444 Parkway Dr
Lincolnshire, Lake County, IL 60069

**Lake County**

Class: A, Market Rate
ID: 1791; YrQtr: 20182



<u>Utility Description</u>	<u>L</u>	<u>T</u>	<u>Service</u>	<u>L</u>	<u>T</u>
Lights		✓	Trash		✓
Gas Forced Air Heat		✓	Water		✓
Unit Central AC		✓	Cable TV		✓
L=Landlord pays, T=Tenant pays			Internet		✓

<u>Physical Profile</u>
Units: 302
Avg Unit SF: 953
Built: 2018
Renovated: na

<u>Economic Profile</u>
Occupancy:
Quoted Rent: \$2.42
Concessions: 12.5%
Effective Rent: \$2.12

<u>Unit Description</u>	<u>Units</u>	<u>Pct</u>	<u>Sq Ft</u>	<u>Quoted Rent</u>				<u>Net Effective Rent</u>		
				<u>Rent</u>	<u>PSF</u>	<u>PSF Avg</u>	<u>Concession</u>	<u>Rent</u>	<u>PSF</u>	<u>PSF Avg</u>
Studio	34	11.3%	475	\$1,300	\$2.74	\$2.61	12.5%	\$1,138	\$2.39	\$2.28
1.0 Bath			636	\$1,575	\$2.48			\$1,378	\$2.17	
One Bedroom	88	29.1%	698	\$1,665	\$2.39	\$2.39	12.5%	\$1,457	\$2.09	\$2.09
1.0 Bath			811	\$1,940	\$2.39			\$1,698	\$2.09	
One Bedroom	23	7.6%	822	\$1,945	\$2.37	\$2.38	12.5%	\$1,702	\$2.07	\$2.08
1.0 Bath			822	\$1,970	\$2.40			\$1,724	\$2.10	
One Bedroom + Den	16	5.3%	841	\$2,025	\$2.41	\$2.42	12.5%	\$1,772	\$2.11	\$2.12
1.0 Bath			847	\$2,060	\$2.43			\$1,803	\$2.13	
Two Bedroom	71	23.5%	940	\$2,260	\$2.40	\$2.42	12.5%	\$1,978	\$2.10	\$2.11
1.0-2.0 Bath			1,224	\$2,970	\$2.43			\$2,599	\$2.12	
Two Bedroom + Den	55	18.2%	1,137	\$2,755	\$2.42	\$2.43	12.5%	\$2,411	\$2.12	\$2.13
2.0 Bath			1,452	\$3,550	\$2.44			\$3,106	\$2.14	
Three Bedroom	15	5.0%	1,397	\$3,385	\$2.42	\$2.41	12.5%	\$2,962	\$2.12	\$2.11
2.0 Bath			1,544	\$3,695	\$2.39			\$3,233	\$2.09	

Paid Parking: \$75 (Reserved Gar/Encl) to \$150 (Reserved Gar/Encl) per month. Free parking available.

Amenities

<u>Unit</u>	<u>Appliance</u>	<u>Common</u>
Vinyl Plank Floors	Disposal	Business Center
9' Ceiling	Dishwasher	Conference Room
Smooth Ceiling	Microwave	Movie Theater Rm
Window Roller Shades	Range	Party/Social Room
Quartz Counters	Refrigerator	Pets Allowed
Tile Backsplash	WasherDryer Incl	Fire Pit
Undermount Sinks	Fitness	Grilling Area
Patio/Balcony/Deck	Fitness Center	Dog Run
	Outdoor Pool	Golf Simulator
	Bike Storage	Parking
	Rooftop Sundeck	Reserved Gar/Encl
	Fitness Trails	

Trends

<u>Yr-Qtr</u>	<u>Quoted PSF</u>	<u>Concession</u>	<u>Occup %</u>	<u>Net PSF</u>
20182	\$2.42	12.5%	0.0%	\$2.12

Notes: 2Q18- Concessions also include 6 months parking. Occupancy is in October, 2018.
Parking range is based on uncovered and covered reserved spaces.


Smash Residential

Aloft at Glen Town Center

1991 Tower Drive (S of Willow Rd, W of Rt 43)
Glenview, Cook County, IL 60026

**North Shore**

Class: A, Market Rate
ID: 540; YrQtr: 20182



<u>Utility Description</u>	<u>L</u>	<u>T</u>	<u>Service</u>	<u>L</u>	<u>T</u>
Lights		✓	Trash		✓
Gas Forced Air Heat	✓		Water	✓	
Unit Central AC	✓		Cable TV	✓	
L=Landlord pays, T=Tenant pays			Internet	✓	

<u>Physical Profile</u>	
Units:	181
Avg Unit SF:	1,141
Built:	2004
Renovated:	na

<u>Economic Profile</u>	
Occupancy:	89.5%
Quoted Rent:	\$2.05
Concessions:	8.3%
Effective Rent:	\$1.88

<u>Unit Description</u>	<u>Units</u>	<u>Pct</u>	<u>Sq Ft</u>	<u>Quoted Rent</u>				<u>Net Effective Rent</u>		
				<u>Rent</u>	<u>PSF</u>	<u>PSF Avg</u>	<u>Concession</u>	<u>Rent</u>	<u>PSF</u>	<u>PSF Avg</u>
One Bedroom	81	44.8%	775	\$1,600	\$2.06	\$2.21	8.3%	\$1,467	\$1.89	\$2.02
1.0 Bath			1,000	\$2,350	\$2.35			\$2,154	\$2.15	
One Bedroom + Den	8	4.4%	1,050	\$2,350	\$2.24	\$2.07	8.3%	\$2,154	\$2.05	\$1.90
1.0-2.0 Bath			1,325	\$2,520	\$1.90			\$2,310	\$1.74	
Two Bedroom	90	49.7%	1,100	\$2,155	\$1.96	\$1.95	8.3%	\$1,975	\$1.80	\$1.78
2.0 Bath			1,600	\$3,090	\$1.93			\$2,833	\$1.77	
Two Bedroom + Den	2	1.1%	1,800	\$3,810	\$2.12	\$2.45	8.3%	\$3,493	\$1.94	\$2.24
2.0 Bath			1,800	\$5,000	\$2.78			\$4,583	\$2.55	

Paid Parking: \$75 (Self-Park Gar/Encl) to \$125 (Reserved Gar/Encl) per month. Free parking available.

Amenities

<u>Unit</u>	<u>Appliance</u>	<u>Common</u>
Carpeting	Disposal	Business Center
Wood Floors	Dishwasher	Clubhouse
9' Ceiling	Microwave	Conference Room
Smooth Ceiling	Range - Gas	Movie Theater Rm
Window Blinds	Refrigerator	Pets Allowed
Granite Counters	WasherDryer Incl	Parking
Patio/Balcony/Deck	Fitness	Reserved Gar/Encl
	Fitness Center	
	Bike Storage	

Trends

<u>Yr-Qtr</u>	<u>Quoted PSF</u>	<u>Concession</u>	<u>Occup %</u>	<u>Net PSF</u>
20182	\$2.05	8.3%	89.5%	\$1.88
20181	\$2.05	8.3%	86.7%	\$1.88
20174	\$2.05	0.0%	91.7%	\$2.05
20173	\$2.05	0.0%	96.1%	\$2.05
20172	\$2.05	0.0%	95.0%	\$2.05
20171	\$2.12	7.0%	92.3%	\$1.97
20164	\$2.12	0.0%	97.2%	\$2.12
20163	\$2.30	0.0%	97.8%	\$2.30
20162	\$2.12	0.0%	97.2%	\$2.12

Notes: Marketing began in December 2003. Two buildings, 3-stories each with retail on first floor. Participate in RUBS Program. Free parking available in detached garage across the street from property. Parking fees listed are for underground parking.

Oliver McMillan

Buckingham Place


750 E Northwest Hwy

Des Plaines, Cook County, IL 60016

**Cook County - Northwest**

Class: A, Market Rate

ID: 1796; YrQtr: 20182



<u>Utility Description</u>	<u>L</u>	<u>T</u>	<u>Service</u>	<u>L</u>	<u>T</u>
Lights	✓		Trash	✓	
Gas Forced Air Heat	✓		Water	✓	
Unit Central AC	✓		Cable TV	✓	
L=Landlord pays, T=Tenant pays			Internet	✓	

<u>Physical Profile</u>	
Units:	267
Avg Unit SF:	961
Built:	2018
Renovated:	na

<u>Economic Profile</u>	
Occupancy:	
Quoted Rent:	\$1.94
Concessions:	5.6%
Effective Rent:	\$1.84

<u>Unit Description</u>	<u>Units</u>	<u>Pct</u>	<u>Sq Ft</u>	<u>Quoted Rent</u>				<u>Concession</u>	<u>Net Effective Rent</u>		
				<u>Rent</u>	<u>PSF</u>	<u>PSF Avg</u>			<u>Rent</u>	<u>PSF</u>	<u>PSF Avg</u>
Studio	19	7.1%	603	\$1,437	\$2.38	\$2.40		5.6%	\$1,357	\$2.25	\$2.26
1.0 Bath			603	\$1,452	\$2.41				\$1,371	\$2.27	
One Bedroom	130	48.7%	743	\$1,661	\$2.24	\$2.05		5.6%	\$1,569	\$2.11	\$1.93
1.0 Bath			960	\$1,783	\$1.86				\$1,684	\$1.75	
Two Bedroom	113	42.3%	951	\$1,916	\$2.01	\$1.88		5.6%	\$1,810	\$1.90	\$1.78
2.0 Bath			1,271	\$2,220	\$1.75				\$2,097	\$1.65	
Three Bedroom	5	1.9%	1,786	\$2,748	\$1.54	\$1.55		5.6%	\$2,595	\$1.45	\$1.47
2.0 Bath			1,786	\$2,798	\$1.57				\$2,643	\$1.48	

Paid Parking: \$75 (Reserved Gar/Encl) per month.

Amenities

<u>Unit</u>	<u>Appliance</u>	<u>Common</u>
Carpeting	Disposal	Party/Social Room
Vinyl Plank Floors	Dishwasher	Smoke Free
9' Ceiling	Microwave	Extra Storage
Smooth Ceiling	Range - Electric	Pets Allowed
Window Blinds	WasherDryer Incl	Grilling Area
Quartz Counters	Fitness	Pet Wash Station
Tile Backsplash	Fitness Center	Parking
Undermount Sinks	Outdoor Pool	Reserved Gar/Encl
Patio/Balcony/Deck	Hot Tub	
	Bike Storage	
	Rooftop Sundeck	

Trends

<u>Yr-Qtr</u>	<u>Quoted PSF</u>	<u>Concession</u>	<u>Occup %</u>	<u>Net PSF</u>
20182	\$1.94	5.6%		\$1.84

Notes: Occupancy began Mid August 2018.**Marquette Management**

Deer Park Crossing


21599 W Field Ct

Deer Park, Lake County, IL 60010

Lake County

Class: A, Market Rate

ID: 1751; YrQtr: 20182



Utility Description	L	T	Service	L	T
Lights		✓	Trash		✓
Gas Forced Air Heat		✓	Water		✓
Unit Central AC		✓	Cable TV		✓
L=Landlord pays, T=Tenant pays			Internet		✓

Physical Profile

Units: **236**
 Avg Unit SF: **1,350**
 Built: **2018**
 Renovated: **na**

Economic Profile

Occupancy: **40.3%**
 Quoted Rent: **\$1.98**
 Concessions: **14.3%**
 Effective Rent: **\$1.70**

Unit Description	Units	Pct	Sq Ft	Quoted Rent				Net Effective Rent		
				Rent	PSF	PSF Avg	Concession	Rent	PSF	PSF Avg
One Bedroom	96	40.7%	806	\$1,699	\$2.11	\$2.30	14.3%	\$1,456	\$1.81	\$1.97
1.0 Bath			927	\$2,307	\$2.49			\$1,977	\$2.13	
Two Bedroom	96	40.7%	1,312	\$2,569	\$1.96	\$1.93	14.3%	\$2,202	\$1.68	\$1.65
2.0 Bath			1,647	\$3,127	\$1.90			\$2,680	\$1.63	
Three Bedroom	44	18.6%	1,965	\$3,414	\$1.74	\$1.78	14.3%	\$2,926	\$1.49	\$1.53
2.5 Bath			2,283	\$4,160	\$1.82			\$3,566	\$1.56	
● TH, includes 2 car att garage										

Paid Parking: \$150 (Reserved Gar/Encl) per month.

Amenities

Unit	Appliance	Common
Carpeting	Disposal	Business Center
Vinyl Plank Floors	Dishwasher	Clubhouse
9' Ceiling	Microwave	Movie Theater Rm
Smooth Ceiling	Range - Gas	Pets Allowed
Window Blinds	Refrigerator	Fire Pit
Quartz Counters	WasherDryer Incl	Grilling Area
Tile Backsplash	Fitness	Dog Run
Undermount Sinks	Fitness Center	Parking
Patio/Balcony/Deck	Outdoor Pool	Attached Garage
		Self-Park Gar/Encl
		Reserved Gar/Encl

Trends

Yr-Qtr	Quoted PSF	Concession	Occup %	Net PSF
20182	\$1.98	14.3%	40.3%	\$1.70
20181	\$1.92	10.7%	42.4%	\$1.72

Notes: First move-ins THs - 01/2018. First move-ins Apts - Late 03/2018. Construction is ongoing - 2018. Reserved garage parking in elevator bldg. THs have attached garage.


Lincoln Property

Dunton Tower

55 South Vail Avenue (Vail Ave, S of Northwest Hwy)
Arlington Heights, Cook County, IL 60005

**Cook County-Northwest**

Class: B, Market Rate
ID: 407; YrQtr: 20182



<u>Utility Description</u>	<u>L</u>	<u>T</u>	<u>Service</u>	<u>L</u>	<u>T</u>
Lights		✓	Trash		✓
Gas Forced Air Heat	✓		Water		✓
Unit Central AC		✓	Cable TV		✓
L=Landlord pays, T=Tenant pays			Internet		✓

Physical Profile

Units: **216**
Avg Unit SF: **902**
Built: **1986**
Renovated: **2006**

Economic Profile

Occupancy: **98.1%**
Quoted Rent: **\$1.92**
Concessions: **0.0%**
Effective Rent: **\$1.92**

<u>Unit Description</u>	<u>Units</u>	<u>Pct</u>	<u>Sq Ft</u>	<u>Quoted Rent</u>				<u>Net Effective Rent</u>		
				<u>Rent</u>	<u>PSF</u>	<u>PSF Avg</u>	<u>Concession</u>	<u>Rent</u>	<u>PSF</u>	<u>PSF Avg</u>
Studio	27	12.5%	600	\$1,270	\$2.12	\$2.13	0.0%	\$1,270	\$2.12	\$2.13
1.0 Bath			600	\$1,289	\$2.15			\$1,289	\$2.15	
One Bedroom	108	50.0%	785	\$1,639	\$2.09	\$2.14	0.0%	\$1,639	\$2.09	\$2.14
1.0 Bath			800	\$1,754	\$2.19			\$1,754	\$2.19	
Two Bedroom	81	37.5%	1,100	\$1,854	\$1.69	\$1.68	0.0%	\$1,854	\$1.69	\$1.68
2.0 Bath			1,200	\$1,999	\$1.67			\$1,999	\$1.67	

Paid Parking: \$75 (Attached Garage) per month.

Amenities

<u>Unit</u>	<u>Appliance</u>	<u>Common</u>
Carpeting	Disposal	Laundry Room
Vinyl Plank Floors	Dishwasher	Business Center
Popcorn Ceiling	Microwave	Clubhouse
Window Blinds	Range - Electric	Party/Social Room
Granite Counters	Refrigerator	Extra Storage
Undermount Sinks	Fitness	Pets Allowed
Patio/Balcony/Deck		Grilling Area
	Fitness Center	Parking
	Outdoor Pool	
	Sauna	
	Whirlpool	Self-Park Gar/Encl

Trends

<u>Yr-Qtr</u>	<u>Quoted PSF</u>	<u>Concession</u>	<u>Occup %</u>	<u>Net PSF</u>
20182	\$1.92	0.0%	98.1%	\$1.92
20181	\$1.94	0.0%	94.0%	\$1.94
20174	\$1.85	0.0%	95.4%	\$1.85
20173	\$1.84	0.0%	96.8%	\$1.84
20172	\$1.90	0.0%	97.2%	\$1.90
20171	\$1.85	0.0%	92.6%	\$1.85
20164	\$1.70	0.0%	90.7%	\$1.70
20163	\$1.79	0.0%	97.7%	\$1.79
20162	\$1.76	0.0%	98.1%	\$1.76

Notes:

Lincoln Property


Hancock Square At Arlington Station

200 North Arlington Heights Road (Arlington Hts Rd, N of Northwest Hwy)
Arlington Heights, Cook County, IL 60004



Cook County-Northwest

Class: B, Market Rate
ID: 178; YrQtr: 20182



Utility Description	L	T	Service	L	T
Lights	✓		Trash	✓	
Gas Forced Air Heat	✓		Water	✓	
Unit Central AC	✓		Cable TV	✓	
L=Landlord pays, T=Tenant pays			Internet	✓	

Physical Profile

Units: **409**
Avg Unit SF: **849**
Built: **1988**
Renovated: **2016**

Economic Profile

Occupancy: **96.3%**
Quoted Rent: **\$2.34**
Concessions: **0.0%**
Effective Rent: **\$2.34**

Unit Description	Units	Pct	Sq Ft	Quoted Rent				Concession	Net Effective Rent		
				Rent	PSF	PSF Avg			Rent	PSF	PSF Avg
Studio	30	7.3%	608	\$1,358	\$2.23	\$2.41		0.0%	\$1,358	\$2.23	\$2.41
1.0 Bath			608	\$1,570	\$2.58				\$1,570	\$2.58	
One Bedroom	143	35.0%	677	\$1,682	\$2.48	\$2.56		0.0%	\$1,682	\$2.48	\$2.56
1.0 Bath			677	\$1,781	\$2.63				\$1,781	\$2.63	
One Bedroom + Den	89	21.8%	850	\$1,869	\$2.20	\$2.16		0.0%	\$1,869	\$2.20	\$2.16
1.0 Bath			925	\$1,964	\$2.12				\$1,964	\$2.12	
Two Bedroom	87	21.3%	975	\$2,227	\$2.28	\$2.32		0.0%	\$2,227	\$2.28	\$2.32
2.0 Bath			991	\$2,343	\$2.36				\$2,343	\$2.36	
Two Bedroom	60	14.7%	1,128	\$2,500	\$2.22	\$2.24		0.0%	\$2,500	\$2.22	\$2.24
2.0 Bath			1,128	\$2,546	\$2.26				\$2,546	\$2.26	
● 30 units incl a den											

Paid Parking: \$75 (Attached Garage) per month.

Amenities

Unit	Appliance	Common
Carpeting	Disposal	Business Center
Popcorn Ceiling	Dishwasher	Clubhouse
Window Blinds	Microwave	Party/Social Room
Granite Counters	Range - Electric	Extra Storage
Undermount Sinks	Refrigerator	Pets Allowed
Patio/Balcony/Deck	WasherDryer Incl	Grilling Area
	Fitness	Picnic Tables
	Fitness Center	Parking
	Outdoor Pool	Self-Park Gar/Encl
	Indoor Pool	
	Sauna	
	Whirlpool	
	Bike Storage	

Trends

Yr-Qtr	Quoted PSF	Concession	Occup %	Net PSF
20182	\$2.34	0.0%	96.3%	\$2.34
20181	\$2.39	0.0%	97.6%	\$2.39
20174	\$1.96	0.0%	95.6%	\$1.96
20173	\$1.93	0.0%	93.9%	\$1.93
20172	\$2.15	0.0%	97.3%	\$2.15
20171	\$2.27	0.0%	93.9%	\$2.27
20164	\$2.00	0.0%	96.3%	\$2.00
20163	\$1.87	0.0%	95.6%	\$1.87
20162	\$1.94	0.0%	96.3%	\$1.94

Notes: Mixed use building with 40,297 square feet of retail and 346,570 square feet of residential space.

Lincoln Property

Kingston Pointe


1646 River St

Des Plaines, Cook County, IL 60016

**Cook County-Northwest**

Class: A, Market Rate

ID: 1044; YrQtr: 20182



<u>Utility Description</u>	<u>L</u>	<u>T</u>	<u>Service</u>	<u>L</u>	<u>T</u>
Lights		✓	Trash		✓
Gas Forced Air Heat		✓	Water		✓
Unit Central AC		✓	Cable TV		✓
L=Landlord pays, T=Tenant pays					
			Internet		✓

Physical Profile

Units: **144**
 Avg Unit SF: **1,203**
 Built: **2009**
 Renovated: **na**

Economic Profile

Occupancy: **91.7%**
 Quoted Rent: **\$1.79**
 Concessions: **0.0%**
 Effective Rent: **\$1.79**

<u>Unit Description</u>	<u>Units</u>	<u>Pct</u>	<u>Sq Ft</u>	<u>Quoted Rent</u>				<u>Concession</u>	<u>Net Effective Rent</u>		
				<u>Rent</u>	<u>PSF</u>	<u>PSF Avg</u>			<u>Rent</u>	<u>PSF</u>	<u>PSF Avg</u>
One Bedroom	34	23.6%	820	\$1,625	\$1.98	\$1.90		0.0%	\$1,625	\$1.98	\$1.90
1.0 Bath			1,005	\$1,835	\$1.83				\$1,835	\$1.83	
One Bedroom + Den	28	19.4%	971	\$1,847	\$1.90	\$1.85		0.0%	\$1,847	\$1.90	\$1.85
1.0 Bath			1,089	\$1,950	\$1.79				\$1,950	\$1.79	
Two Bedroom	72	50.0%	1,207	\$2,099	\$1.74	\$1.78		0.0%	\$2,099	\$1.74	\$1.78
2.0 Bath			1,448	\$2,650	\$1.83				\$2,650	\$1.83	
Two Bedroom + Den	7	4.9%	1,769	\$2,650	\$1.50	\$1.50		0.0%	\$2,650	\$1.50	\$1.50
2.5 Bath			1,769	\$2,650	\$1.50				\$2,650	\$1.50	
Three Bedroom	3	2.1%	1,725	\$3,142	\$1.82	\$1.73		0.0%	\$3,142	\$1.82	\$1.73
3.0 Bath & up			1,924	\$3,142	\$1.63				\$3,142	\$1.63	

Paid Parking: \$50 (Surface Parking) to \$100 (Reserved Gar/Encl) per month.

Amenities

<u>Unit</u>	<u>Appliance</u>	<u>Common</u>
Carpeting	Disposal	Extra Storage
Wood Floors	Dishwasher	Pets Allowed
9' Ceiling	Microwave	Parking
Smooth Ceiling	Range - Gas	Self-Park Gar/Encl
Window Blinds	Refrigerator	
Granite Counters	WasherDryer Incl	
Patio/Balcony/Deck	Fitness	
	Bike Storage	
	Fitness Trails	

Trends

<u>Yr-Qtr</u>	<u>Quoted PSF</u>	<u>Concession</u>	<u>Occup %</u>	<u>Net PSF</u>
20182	\$1.79	0.0%	91.7%	\$1.79
20181	\$1.77	2.5%	88.9%	\$1.72
20174	\$1.71	0.0%	93.8%	\$1.71
20173	\$1.70	0.0%	93.1%	\$1.70
20172	\$1.76	8.1%	91.7%	\$1.62
20171	\$1.72	8.1%	89.6%	\$1.58
20164	\$1.69	0.0%	93.1%	\$1.69
20163	\$1.79	0.0%	95.8%	\$1.79
20162	\$1.80	1.4%	94.4%	\$1.77

Notes: Building began as Everleigh Condos, developed by Sertus Capital Partners LLC. **Apartment Management Consultants LLC**

Only 3 units sold and it has since become a rental property. Leasing began in the spring of 2011. The property has no recreational amenities. All units include one parking space.

Midtown Square


998 Church St

Glenview, Cook County, IL 60025

**North Shore**

Class: A, Market Rate

ID: 1344; YrQtr: 20182



<u>Utility Description</u>	<u>L</u>	<u>T</u>	<u>Service</u>	<u>L</u>	<u>T</u>
Lights	✓		Trash	✓	
Gas Forced Air Heat	✓		Water	✓	
Unit Central AC	✓		Cable TV	✓	
L=Landlord pays, T=Tenant pays			Internet	✓	

Physical Profile

Units: **138**
 Avg Unit SF: **920**
 Built: **2014**
 Renovated: **na**

Economic Profile

Occupancy: **94.9%**
 Quoted Rent: **\$2.40**
 Concessions: **6.2%**
 Effective Rent: **\$2.25**

<u>Unit Description</u>	<u>Units</u>	<u>Pct</u>	<u>Sq Ft</u>	<u>Quoted Rent</u>			<u>Concession</u>	<u>Net Effective Rent</u>		
				<u>Rent</u>	<u>PSF</u>	<u>PSF Avg</u>		<u>Rent</u>	<u>PSF</u>	<u>PSF Avg</u>
One Bedroom	99	71.7%	763	\$1,758	\$2.30	\$2.42	6.2%	\$1,650	\$2.16	\$2.27
1.0 Bath			909	\$2,304	\$2.53			\$2,162	\$2.38	
Two Bedroom	39	28.3%	923	\$2,467	\$2.67	\$2.40	6.3%	\$2,312	\$2.51	\$2.25
2.0 Bath			1,341	\$2,843	\$2.12			\$2,665	\$1.99	

Paid Parking: \$135 (Reserved Gar/Encl) per month. Free parking available.

Amenities

<u>Unit</u>	<u>Appliance</u>	<u>Common</u>
Carpeting	Disposal	Clubhouse
Wood Floors	Dishwasher	Party/Social Room
9' Ceiling	Microwave	Extra Storage
Window Blinds	Range - Gas	Pets Allowed
Quartz Counters	Refrigerator	Pet Wash Station
Tile Backsplash	WasherDryer Incl	Parking
Undermount Sinks	Fitness	Surface Parking
Patio/Balcony/Deck	Fitness Center	Attached Garage
	Bike Storage	

Trends

<u>Yr-Qtr</u>	<u>Quoted PSF</u>	<u>Concession</u>	<u>Occup %</u>	<u>Net PSF</u>
20182	\$2.40	6.2%	94.9%	\$2.25
20181	\$2.53	16.7%	89.1%	\$2.11
20174	\$2.36	16.7%	90.6%	\$1.97
20173	\$2.41	5.4%	92.0%	\$2.28
20172	\$2.43	0.0%	94.9%	\$2.43
20171	\$2.42	8.3%	92.8%	\$2.22
20164	\$2.43	0.0%	85.5%	\$2.43
20163	\$2.43	0.0%	92.8%	\$2.43
20162	\$2.50	0.0%	95.7%	\$2.50

Notes:


Lincoln Property

North680

680 E Algonquin Rd
Schaumburg, Cook County, IL 60173

**Cook County-Northwest**

Class: A, Market Rate
ID: 1645; YrQtr: 20182



<u>Utility Description</u>	<u>L</u>	<u>T</u>	<u>Service</u>	<u>L</u>	<u>T</u>
Lights		✓	Trash		✓
Gas Forced Air Heat		✓	Water		✓
Unit Central AC		✓	Cable TV		✓
L=Landlord pays, T=Tenant pays			Internet		✓

<u>Physical Profile</u>	
Units:	180
Avg Unit SF:	894
Built:	2017
Renovated:	na

<u>Economic Profile</u>	
Occupancy:	87.8%
Quoted Rent:	\$2.21
Concessions:	0.0%
Effective Rent:	\$2.21

<u>Unit Description</u>	<u>Units</u>	<u>Pct</u>	<u>Sq Ft</u>	<u>Quoted Rent</u>				<u>Net Effective Rent</u>		
				<u>Rent</u>	<u>PSF</u>	<u>PSF Avg</u>	<u>Concession</u>	<u>Rent</u>	<u>PSF</u>	<u>PSF Avg</u>
One Bedroom	104	57.8%	665	\$1,629	\$2.45	\$2.42	0.0%	\$1,629	\$2.45	\$2.42
1.0 Bath			785	\$1,869	\$2.38			\$1,869	\$2.38	
One Bedroom + Den	24	13.3%	1,039	\$2,119	\$2.04	\$2.10	0.0%	\$2,119	\$2.04	\$2.10
1.0 Bath			1,039	\$2,250	\$2.17			\$2,250	\$2.17	
Two Bedroom	48	26.7%	1,130	\$2,229	\$1.97	\$1.99	0.0%	\$2,229	\$1.97	\$1.99
2.0 Bath			1,130	\$2,279	\$2.02			\$2,279	\$2.02	
Two Bedroom	4	2.2%	1,588	\$3,409	\$2.15	\$2.15	0.0%	\$3,409	\$2.15	\$2.15
2.0 Bath			1,588	\$3,409	\$2.15			\$3,409	\$2.15	
● Townhomes										

Paid Parking: \$75 (Detached Garage) to \$120 (Attached Garage) per month. Free parking available.

Amenities

<u>Unit</u>	<u>Appliance</u>	<u>Common</u>
Carpeting	Disposal	Business Center
Vinyl Plank Floors	Dishwasher	Clubhouse
9' Ceiling	Microwave	Party/Social Room
Smooth Ceiling	Range - Electric	Extra Storage
Window Blinds	Refrigerator	Pets Allowed
Granite Counters	WasherDryer Incl	Fire Pit
Tile Backsplash	Fitness	Grilling Area
Undermount Sinks	Fitness Center	Dog Run
Patio/Balcony/Deck	Outdoor Pool	Parking
	Bike Storage	Surface Parking
		Attached Garage
		Detached Garage

Trends

<u>Yr-Qtr</u>	<u>Quoted PSF</u>	<u>Concession</u>	<u>Occup %</u>	<u>Net PSF</u>
20182	\$2.21	0.0%	87.8%	\$2.21
20181	\$2.23	0.0%	90.0%	\$2.23
20174	\$2.22	7.7%	61.1%	\$2.05
20173	\$2.25	11.5%	49.4%	\$1.99
20172	\$2.25	7.7%	29.4%	\$2.08
20171	\$2.21	0.0%	16.7%	\$2.21

Notes: Occupancy started April 17, 2017. Tenants to be billed for water and trash, estimated at about \$20 per month.

North American Properties

Northgate Crossing


200 Hudson Court

Wheeling, Cook County, IL 60090

**Cook County-Northwest**

Class: A, Market Rate

ID: 1505; YrQtr: 20182



<u>Utility Description</u>	<u>L</u>	<u>T</u>	<u>Service</u>	<u>L</u>	<u>T</u>
Lights		✓	Trash		✓
Gas Forced Air Heat		✓	Water		✓
Unit Central AC		✓	Cable TV		✓
L=Landlord pays, T=Tenant pays			Internet		✓

Physical Profile

Units: **300**
 Avg Unit SF: **969**
 Built: **2016**
 Renovated: **na**

Economic Profile

Occupancy: **87.7%**
 Quoted Rent: **\$1.83**
 Concessions: **11.5%**
 Effective Rent: **\$1.62**

<u>Unit Description</u>	<u>Units</u>	<u>Pct</u>	<u>Sq Ft</u>	<u>Quoted Rent</u>				<u>Net Effective Rent</u>		
				<u>Rent</u>	<u>PSF</u>	<u>PSF Avg</u>	<u>Concession</u>	<u>Rent</u>	<u>PSF</u>	<u>PSF Avg</u>
One Bedroom	162	54.0%	696	\$1,535	\$2.21	\$2.12	11.5%	\$1,358	\$1.95	\$1.87
1.0 Bath			873	\$1,770	\$2.03			\$1,566	\$1.79	
One Bedroom + Den	20	6.7%	883	\$1,750	\$1.98	\$2.01	11.5%	\$1,548	\$1.75	\$1.78
1.0 Bath			883	\$1,800	\$2.04			\$1,592	\$1.80	
Two Bedroom	16	5.3%	883	\$1,670	\$1.89	\$1.97	11.5%	\$1,477	\$1.67	\$1.75
1.0 Bath			883	\$1,815	\$2.06			\$1,606	\$1.82	
Two Bedroom	90	30.0%	1,190	\$1,645	\$1.38	\$1.57	11.5%	\$1,455	\$1.22	\$1.39
2.0 Bath			1,212	\$2,125	\$1.75			\$1,880	\$1.55	
Three Bedroom	12	4.0%	1,971	\$2,690	\$1.36	\$1.36	11.5%	\$2,380	\$1.21	\$1.21
2.0 Bath			2,005	\$2,730	\$1.36			\$2,415	\$1.20	
• TH										

Paid Parking: \$145 (Self-Park Gar/Encl) to \$175 (Self-Park Gar/Encl) per month. Free parking available.

Amenities

<u>Unit</u>	<u>Appliance</u>	<u>Common</u>
Carpeting	Disposal	Business Center
Vinyl Plank Floors	Dishwasher	Clubhouse
Smooth Ceiling	Microwave	Movie Theater Rm
Window Blinds	Range - Gas	Party/Social Room
Granite Counters	Refrigerator	Smoke Free
Granite Islands	WasherDryer Incl	Extra Storage
Undermount Sinks	Fitness	Pets Allowed
Patio/Balcony/Deck	Fitness Center	Fire Pit
	Outdoor Pool	Grilling Area
	Fitness Trails	LEED Silver
		Parking
		Self-Park Gar/Encl

Trends

<u>Yr-Qtr</u>	<u>Quoted PSF</u>	<u>Concession</u>	<u>Occup %</u>	<u>Net PSF</u>
20182	\$1.83	11.5%	87.7%	\$1.62
20181	\$1.89	10.7%	84.3%	\$1.69
20174	\$1.85	0.0%	90.0%	\$1.85
20173	\$1.77	4.7%	79.7%	\$1.69
20172	\$1.89	4.8%	79.7%	\$1.80
20171	\$1.90	4.2%	64.9%	\$1.82
20164	\$1.85	0.0%	52.4%	\$1.85
20163	\$1.84	8.5%	60.1%	\$1.69
20162	\$1.84	8.5%	28.1%	\$1.69

Notes: Occupancy began 12/2015. Construction complete Summer 2017. Parking range is based on size of the space.

Lincoln Property

One Arlington


3400 W Stonegate Blvd

Arlington Heights, Cook County, IL 60005

**Cook County-Northwest**

Class: A, Market Rate

ID: 1342; YrQtr: 20182



Utility Description	L	T	Service	L	T
Lights		✓	Trash		✓
Gas Forced Air Heat		✓	Water		✓
Unit Central AC		✓	Cable TV		✓
L=Landlord pays, T=Tenant pays			Internet		✓

Physical Profile

Units:	214
Avg Unit SF:	936
Built:	2014
Renovated:	na

Economic Profile

Occupancy:	93.9%
Quoted Rent:	\$2.08
Concessions:	0.0%
Effective Rent:	\$2.08

Unit Description	Units	Pct	Sq Ft	Quoted Rent				Concession	Net Effective Rent		
				Rent	PSF	PSF Avg			Rent	PSF	PSF Avg
Studio	51	23.8%	549	\$1,449	\$2.64	\$2.33		0.0%	\$1,449	\$2.64	\$2.33
1.0 Bath			769	\$1,549	\$2.01				\$1,549	\$2.01	
One Bedroom	113	52.8%	803	\$1,599	\$1.99	\$1.97		0.0%	\$1,599	\$1.99	\$1.97
1.0 Bath			1,012	\$1,965	\$1.94				\$1,965	\$1.94	
Two Bedroom	36	16.8%	1,193	\$2,499	\$2.09	\$2.10		0.0%	\$2,499	\$2.09	\$2.10
2.0 Bath			1,273	\$2,669	\$2.10				\$2,669	\$2.10	
Two Bedroom	14	6.5%	1,303	\$3,245	\$2.49	\$2.31		0.0%	\$3,245	\$2.49	\$2.31
2.0 Bath			1,521	\$3,245	\$2.13				\$3,245	\$2.13	
• PH											

Paid Parking: \$75 (Reserved Gar/Encl) per month.

Amenities

Unit	Appliance	Common
Carpeting	Disposal	Business Center
Wood Floors	Dishwasher	Clubhouse
8.5' Ceiling	Microwave	Craft/DIY Room
Window Roller Shades	Range - Electric	Movie Theater Rm
Granite Counters	Refrigerator	Party/Social Room
Undermount Sinks	WasherDryer Incl	Extra Storage
Patio/Balcony/Deck	Fitness	Pets Allowed
	Fitness Center	Car Charging Station
	Bike Storage	Pet Wash Station
	Rooftop Sundeck	Golf Simulator
		Parking
		Surface Parking
		Attached Garage

Trends

Yr-Qtr	Quoted PSF	Concession	Occup %	Net PSF
20182	\$2.08	0.0%	93.9%	\$2.08
20181	\$2.06	2.8%	90.2%	\$2.00
20174	\$2.21	5.6%	94.9%	\$2.09
20173	\$2.23	4.3%	95.8%	\$2.13
20172	\$2.32	0.0%	96.7%	\$2.32
20171	\$2.16	1.9%	94.9%	\$2.12
20164	\$2.01	0.0%	95.8%	\$2.01
20163	\$2.12	0.0%	94.9%	\$2.12
20162	\$2.07	0.8%	93.5%	\$2.05

Notes: Occupancy began 10/2/14. Upper floors have 9-10' ceilings.**Waterford Residential**

Park 205 Apartments


205 W Touhy Ave

Park Ridge, Cook County, IL 60068

**North Shore**

Class: A, Market Rate

ID: 1475; YrQtr: 20182



<u>Utility Description</u>	<u>L</u>	<u>T</u>	<u>Service</u>	<u>L</u>	<u>T</u>
Lights		✓	Trash		✓
Gas Forced Air Heat		✓	Water		✓
Unit Central AC		✓	Cable TV		✓
L=Landlord pays, T=Tenant pays			Internet		✓

Physical Profile

Units: **115**
 Avg Unit SF: **975**
 Built: **2015**
 Renovated: **na**

Economic Profile

Occupancy: **96.5%**
 Quoted Rent: **\$2.49**
 Concessions: **0.0%**
 Effective Rent: **\$2.49**

<u>Unit Description</u>	<u>Units</u>	<u>Pct</u>	<u>Sq Ft</u>	<u>Quoted Rent</u>				<u>Net Effective Rent</u>		
				<u>Rent</u>	<u>PSF</u>	<u>PSF Avg</u>	<u>Concession</u>	<u>Rent</u>	<u>PSF</u>	<u>PSF Avg</u>
One Bedroom	57	49.6%	606	\$1,725	\$2.85	\$2.56	0.0%	\$1,725	\$2.85	\$2.56
1.0 Bath			881	\$2,000	\$2.27			\$2,000	\$2.27	
One Bedroom + Den	7	6.1%	942	\$2,360	\$2.51	\$2.38	0.0%	\$2,360	\$2.51	\$2.38
1.0 Bath			1,064	\$2,400	\$2.26			\$2,400	\$2.26	
Two Bedroom	45	39.1%	1,080	\$2,695	\$2.50	\$2.47	0.0%	\$2,695	\$2.50	\$2.47
2.0 Bath			1,345	\$3,280	\$2.44			\$3,280	\$2.44	
Two Bedroom + Den	3	2.6%	1,316	\$3,415	\$2.60	\$2.60	0.0%	\$3,415	\$2.60	\$2.60
2.0 Bath			1,316	\$3,415	\$2.60			\$3,415	\$2.60	
Three Bedroom	3	2.6%	1,387	\$3,785	\$2.73	\$2.70	0.0%	\$3,785	\$2.73	\$2.70
2.0 Bath			1,423	\$3,795	\$2.67			\$3,795	\$2.67	

Paid Parking: \$125 (Reserved Gar/Encl) to \$200 (Tandem Space) per month.

Amenities

<u>Unit</u>	<u>Appliance</u>	<u>Common</u>
Carpeting	Disposal	Business Center
Wood Floors	Dishwasher	Party/Social Room
9' Ceiling	Microwave	Extra Storage
Window Blinds	Range - Gas	Pets Allowed
Patio/Balcony/Deck	Refrigerator	Parking
	WasherDryer Incl	Attached Garage
	Fitness	Tandem Space
	Fitness Center	
	Outdoor Pool	

Trends

<u>Yr-Qtr</u>	<u>Quoted PSF</u>	<u>Concession</u>	<u>Occup %</u>	<u>Net PSF</u>
20182	\$2.49	0.0%	96.5%	\$2.49
20181	\$2.47	4.3%	93.0%	\$2.37
20174	\$2.46	0.0%	96.5%	\$2.46
20173	\$2.47	0.0%	94.8%	\$2.47
20172	\$2.44	0.0%	95.7%	\$2.44
20171	\$2.42	4.9%	93.0%	\$2.30
20164	\$2.44	0.0%	93.0%	\$2.44
20163	\$2.43	0.0%	88.7%	\$2.43
20162	\$2.40	8.3%	75.7%	\$2.20

Notes: Leasing began July 2015. Occupancy began Oct 2015. High-end finishes. SS appl, tile backsplash, 42" cabs.

Lincoln Property

Reserve at Glenview


195 N Waukegan Rd

Glenview, Cook County, IL 60025

**North Shore**

Class: A, Market Rate

ID: 1396; YrQtr: 20182



<u>Utility Description</u>	<u>L</u>	<u>T</u>	<u>Service</u>	<u>L</u>	<u>T</u>
Lights	✓		Trash	✓	
Electric Forced Air Heat	✓		Water	✓	
Unit Central AC	✓		Cable TV	✓	
L=Landlord pays, T=Tenant pays			Internet	✓	

Physical Profile

Units: **239**
 Avg Unit SF: **1,013**
 Built: **2015**
 Renovated: **na**

Economic Profile

Occupancy: **89.5%**
 Quoted Rent: **\$2.28**
 Concessions: **4.0%**
 Effective Rent: **\$2.19**

<u>Unit Description</u>	<u>Units</u>	<u>Pct</u>	<u>Sq Ft</u>	<u>Quoted Rent</u>				<u>Concession</u>	<u>Net Effective Rent</u>		
				<u>Rent</u>	<u>PSF</u>	<u>PSF Avg</u>			<u>Rent</u>	<u>PSF</u>	<u>PSF Avg</u>
Studio	6	2.5%	630	\$1,650	\$2.62	\$2.62		0.0%	\$1,650	\$2.62	\$2.62
1.0 Bath			630	\$1,650	\$2.62				\$1,650	\$2.62	
• Reduced Move in Fees											
One Bedroom	103	43.1%	750	\$1,800	\$2.40	\$2.40		2.2%	\$1,760	\$2.35	\$2.35
1.0 Bath			810	\$1,950	\$2.41				\$1,907	\$2.35	
• Reduced Move in Fees											
One Bedroom + Den	18	7.5%	964	\$2,080	\$2.16	\$2.20		2.0%	\$2,039	\$2.12	\$2.16
1.0 Bath			964	\$2,160	\$2.24				\$2,118	\$2.20	
• Reduced Move in Fees											
Two Bedroom	76	31.8%	1,105	\$2,340	\$2.12	\$2.24		4.7%	\$2,230	\$2.02	\$2.13
2.0 Bath			1,271	\$2,990	\$2.35				\$2,850	\$2.24	
• Reduced Move in Fees											
Three Bedroom	36	15.1%	1,385	\$2,925	\$2.11	\$2.15		6.9%	\$2,722	\$1.97	\$2.00
2.0 Bath			1,407	\$3,085	\$2.19				\$2,871	\$2.04	
• Reduced Move in Fees											

Paid Parking: \$75 (Reserved Gar/Encl) to \$125 (Reserved Gar/Encl) per month.

Amenities

<u>Unit</u>	<u>Appliance</u>	<u>Common</u>
Wood Floors	Disposal	Business Center
9' Ceiling	Dishwasher	Party/Social Room
Window Blinds	Microwave	Extra Storage
Patio/Balcony/Deck	Range - Gas	Pets Allowed
	Refrigerator	Grilling Area
	WasherDryer Incl	Dog Run
	Fitness	
	Fitness Center	
	Outdoor Pool	
	Playground	

Trends

<u>Yr-Qtr</u>	<u>Quoted PSF</u>	<u>Concession</u>	<u>Occup %</u>	<u>Net PSF</u>
20182	\$2.28	4.0%	89.5%	\$2.19
20181	\$2.31	0.0%	93.7%	\$2.31
20174	\$2.26	0.0%	92.5%	\$2.26
20173	\$2.33	0.0%	84.9%	\$2.33
20172	\$2.30	0.0%	80.8%	\$2.30
20171	\$2.30	7.6%	88.7%	\$2.13
20164	\$2.30	11.8%	85.4%	\$2.03
20163	\$2.30	8.2%	79.5%	\$2.11
20162	\$2.23	10.8%	71.1%	\$1.99

Notes: In Feb. 2015, there was a trailer opened on site. Occupancy began in May, 2015.
 Located in a shopping center with a Mariano's Supermarket.


Greystar

River 595

595 S River Rd
Des Plaines, Cook County, IL 60016

**Cook County-Northwest**

Class: A, Market Rate
ID: 996; YrQtr: 20182



<u>Utility Description</u>	<u>L</u>	<u>T</u>	<u>Service</u>	<u>L</u>	<u>T</u>
Lights		✓	Trash		✓
Gas Hot Water Heat		✓	Water		✓
Unit Central AC		✓	Cable TV		✓
L=Landlord pays, T=Tenant pays			Internet		✓

<u>Physical Profile</u>	
Units:	60
Avg Unit SF:	1,397
Built:	2011
Renovated:	na

<u>Economic Profile</u>	
Occupancy:	93.3%
Quoted Rent:	\$1.63
Concessions:	7.7%
Effective Rent:	\$1.51

<u>Unit Description</u>	<u>Units</u>	<u>Pct</u>	<u>Sq Ft</u>	<u>Quoted Rent</u>				<u>Concession</u>	<u>Net Effective Rent</u>		
				<u>Rent</u>	<u>PSF</u>	<u>PSF Avg</u>			<u>Rent</u>	<u>PSF</u>	<u>PSF Avg</u>
One Bedroom	5	8.3%	860	\$1,829	\$2.13	\$2.18		7.7%	\$1,688	\$1.96	\$2.02
1.0 Bath			860	\$1,929	\$2.24				\$1,781	\$2.07	
Two Bedroom	5	8.3%	1,325	\$2,159	\$1.63	\$1.66		7.7%	\$1,993	\$1.50	\$1.54
2.0 Bath			1,325	\$2,249	\$1.70				\$2,076	\$1.57	
Two Bedroom + Den	30	50.0%	1,390	\$2,120	\$1.53	\$1.59		7.7%	\$1,957	\$1.41	\$1.47
2.0 Bath			1,390	\$2,300	\$1.65				\$2,123	\$1.53	
• Type B											
Two Bedroom + Den	10	16.7%	1,480	\$2,389	\$1.61	\$1.62		7.7%	\$2,205	\$1.49	\$1.49
2.0 Bath			1,480	\$2,400	\$1.62				\$2,215	\$1.50	
• Type A											
Two Bedroom + Den	5	8.3%	1,620	\$2,569	\$1.59	\$1.60		7.7%	\$2,371	\$1.46	\$1.48
2.0 Bath			1,620	\$2,609	\$1.61				\$2,408	\$1.49	
• Type D											
Two Bedroom + Den	5	8.3%	1,660	\$2,649	\$1.60	\$1.61		7.7%	\$2,445	\$1.47	\$1.48
2.0 Bath			1,660	\$2,689	\$1.62				\$2,482	\$1.50	
• Type C											

Paid Parking: \$100 (Self-Park Gar/Encl) per month. Free parking available.

Amenities

<u>Unit</u>	<u>Appliance</u>	<u>Common</u>
Carpeting	Dishwasher	Business Center
Window Blinds	Microwave	Party/Social Room
Granite Counters	Range	Extra Storage
Granite Islands	Refrigerator	Parking
Patio/Balcony/Deck	Fitness	Self-Park Gar/Encl
	Fitness Center	

Trends

<u>Yr-Qtr</u>	<u>Quoted PSF</u>	<u>Concession</u>	<u>Occup %</u>	<u>Net PSF</u>
20182	\$1.63	7.7%	93.3%	\$1.51
20181	\$1.66	7.7%	91.7%	\$1.53
20174	\$1.66	7.7%	90.0%	\$1.53
20173	\$1.65	7.7%	90.0%	\$1.52
20172	\$1.66	7.7%	91.7%	\$1.53
20171	\$1.66	8.3%	90.0%	\$1.52
20164	\$1.66	15.4%	90.0%	\$1.41
20163	\$1.62	8.3%	83.3%	\$1.48
20162	\$1.64	0.0%	83.3%	\$1.64

Notes: Opened 3/11. Landlord bills back gas, sewer and trash.

Morningside Group

Tapestry Glenview


2550 Waterview Dr

Glenview, Cook County, IL 60062

**North Shore**

Class: A, Market Rate

ID: 1341; YrQtr: 20182



<u>Utility Description</u>	<u>L</u>	<u>T</u>	<u>Service</u>	<u>L</u>	<u>T</u>
Lights		✓	Trash		✓
Gas Forced Air Heat		✓	Water		✓
Unit Central AC		✓	Cable TV		✓
L=Landlord pays, T=Tenant pays			Internet		✓

Physical Profile

Units: **290**
 Avg Unit SF: **887**
 Built: **2014**
 Renovated: **na**

Economic Profile

Occupancy: **99.0%**
 Quoted Rent: **\$2.18**
 Concessions: **3.8%**
 Effective Rent: **\$2.09**

<u>Unit Description</u>	<u>Units</u>	<u>Pct</u>	<u>Sq Ft</u>	<u>Quoted Rent</u>				<u>Net Effective Rent</u>		
				<u>Rent</u>	<u>PSF</u>	<u>PSF Avg</u>	<u>Concession</u>	<u>Rent</u>	<u>PSF</u>	<u>PSF Avg</u>
Studio	29	10.0%	599	\$1,499	\$2.50	\$2.56	0.0%	\$1,499	\$2.50	\$2.56
1.0 Bath			599	\$1,569	\$2.62			\$1,569	\$2.62	
One Bedroom	80	27.6%	715	\$1,699	\$2.38	\$2.38	0.0%	\$1,699	\$2.38	\$2.38
1.0 Bath			715	\$1,699	\$2.38			\$1,699	\$2.38	
One Bedroom	56	19.3%	822	\$1,810	\$2.20	\$2.20	0.0%	\$1,810	\$2.20	\$2.20
1.0 Bath			822	\$1,810	\$2.20			\$1,810	\$2.20	
One Bedroom + Den	12	4.1%	1,019	\$2,049	\$2.01	\$2.01	0.0%	\$2,049	\$2.01	\$2.01
1.0 Bath			1,019	\$2,049	\$2.01			\$2,049	\$2.01	
Two Bedroom	84	29.0%	1,064	\$2,099	\$1.97	\$1.97	8.3%	\$1,924	\$1.81	\$1.81
2.0 Bath			1,064	\$2,099	\$1.97			\$1,924	\$1.81	
Two Bedroom	29	10.0%	1,212	\$2,669	\$2.20	\$2.20	8.3%	\$2,447	\$2.02	\$2.02
2.0 Bath			1,212	\$2,669	\$2.20			\$2,447	\$2.02	

Paid Parking: \$60 (Reserved Gar/Encl) per month.

Amenities

<u>Unit</u>	<u>Appliance</u>	<u>Common</u>
Carpeting	Disposal	Business Center
Wood Floors	Dishwasher	Party/Social Room
9' Ceiling	Microwave	Pets Allowed
Patio/Balcony/Deck	Range - Gas	Parking
	Refrigerator	Attached Garage
	Fitness	
	Fitness Center	
	Outdoor Pool	

Trends

<u>Yr-Qtr</u>	<u>Quoted PSF</u>	<u>Concession</u>	<u>Occup %</u>	<u>Net PSF</u>
20182	\$2.18	3.8%	99.0%	\$2.09
20181	\$2.13	0.0%	97.9%	\$2.13
20174	\$2.11	0.0%	98.6%	\$2.11
20173	\$2.25	6.4%	98.6%	\$2.11
20172	\$2.23	1.9%	92.1%	\$2.18
20171	\$2.19	11.2%	93.8%	\$1.95
20164	\$2.22	3.8%	92.1%	\$2.14
20163	\$2.24	11.4%	89.7%	\$1.98
20162	\$2.24	16.7%	81.4%	\$1.86

Notes: Construction was completed April 2015. Occupancy began 10/10/14.**The Connor Group**

The Residences at Hamilton Lakes

1133 N Arlington Heights Rd


Itasca, DuPage County, IL 60143



DuPage County

Class: A, Market Rate

ID: 1688; YrQtr: 20182



<u>Utility Description</u>	<u>L</u>	<u>T</u>	<u>Service</u>	<u>L</u>	<u>T</u>
Lights	✓		Trash	✓	
Gas Forced Air Heat	✓		Water	✓	
Unit Central AC	✓		Cable TV	✓	
L=Landlord pays, T=Tenant pays			Internet	✓	

Physical Profile

Units:	297
Avg Unit SF:	934
Built:	2015
Renovated:	na

Economic Profile

Occupancy:	55.9%
Quoted Rent:	\$2.24
Concessions:	1.3%
Effective Rent:	\$2.21

<u>Unit Description</u>	<u>Units</u>	<u>Pct</u>	<u>Sq Ft</u>	<u>Quoted Rent</u>				<u>Net Effective Rent</u>		
				<u>Rent</u>	<u>PSF</u>	<u>PSF Avg</u>	<u>Concession</u>	<u>Rent</u>	<u>PSF</u>	<u>PSF Avg</u>
Studio	3	1.0%	472	\$1,340	\$2.84	\$2.84	0.0%	\$1,340	\$2.84	\$2.84
1.0 Bath			472	\$1,340	\$2.84			\$1,340	\$2.84	
One Bedroom	186	62.6%	655	\$1,530	\$2.34	\$2.36	1.4%	\$1,509	\$2.30	\$2.33
1.0 Bath			859	\$2,045	\$2.38			\$2,016	\$2.35	
Two Bedroom	96	32.3%	1,146	\$2,425	\$2.12	\$2.10	1.3%	\$2,393	\$2.09	\$2.07
2.0 Bath			1,299	\$2,705	\$2.08			\$2,670	\$2.06	
Three Bedroom	12	4.0%	1,480	\$3,175	\$2.15	\$2.15	1.3%	\$3,133	\$2.12	\$2.12
2.0 Bath			1,480	\$3,185	\$2.15			\$3,143	\$2.12	

Paid Parking: \$125 (Reserved Gar/Encl) per month.

Amenities

<u>Unit</u>	<u>Appliance</u>	<u>Common</u>
Vinyl Plank Floors	Dishwasher	Business Center
Smooth Ceiling	Microwave	Conference Room
Window Blinds	Range - Gas	Movie Theater Rm
Quartz Counters	Refrigerator	Smoke Free
Tile Backsplash	WasherDryer Incl	Extra Storage
Undermount Sinks	Fitness	Pets Allowed
Patio/Balcony/Deck	Fitness Center	Grilling Area
	Outdoor Pool	Picnic Tables
	Sauna	Car Charging Station
	Hot Tub	Pet Wash Station
	Steam Room	Parking
	Bike Storage	Reserved Gar/Encl
	Rooftop Sundek	

Trends

<u>Yr-Qtr</u>	<u>Quoted PSF</u>	<u>Concession</u>	<u>Occup %</u>	<u>Net PSF</u>
20182	\$2.24	1.3%	55.9%	\$2.21
20181	\$2.24	16.7%	36.0%	\$1.87
20174	\$2.24	11.5%	25.3%	\$1.98
20173	\$2.24	11.5%	21.9%	\$1.98
20172	\$2.24	12.5%	1.7%	\$1.96

Notes: Occupancy began in June 2017.**RMK**

Lease-up Absorption Survey

We have surveyed the market in order to determine the lease-up rates which have been achieved in newly constructed rental buildings in the Suburban Chicago market. Developments which have started lease-up since 2013 are summarized on the following page.

The survey is showing average monthly absorption rates generally ranging from 10 to 20 units per month. Some of the slower leasing properties had issues particularly pertaining to that property, such as challenging locations and seasonal issues that can affect lease-up; for example, properties opening in the 3rd or 4th quarter start out more slowly and generally will not see a pickup in activity until the spring leasing season.

Lease-up Survey

© 2018 Integra Realty Resources - Chicago, All Rights Reserved

Name	Suburb	Submarket	Began	Delivered	Units	1Q13	2Q13	3Q13	4Q13	1Q14	2Q14	3Q14	4Q14	1Q15	2Q15	3Q15	4Q15	1Q16	2Q16	3Q16	4Q16	1Q17	2Q17	3Q17	4Q17	1Q18	2Q18	Avg Leased/ Month
Stabilized Projects																												
The Springs at 127th	Plainfield	Will	1Q2013	Feb-13	340	102	79	18	56	44	28																	18
Amli Evanston	Evanston	North Shore	1Q2013	Mar-13	195	22	29	36	31	34	25																	10
1717	Evanston	North Shore	1Q2013	Mar-13	175	5	101	33	8	22																		11
Ninety7Fifty on the Park	Orland Park	South Cook	2Q2013	Apr-13	295		97	86	24	38	30																	18
Randall Highlands	North Aurora	Kane	2Q2013	Apr-13	146		11	34	32	25	37																	9
Algonquin Square	Algonquin	Kane	2Q2013	Jun-13	220		15	21	70	61	49																	14
Central Station	Evanston	North Shore	2Q2013	Sep-13	80			6	22	11	17	16																5
Avant at the Arboretum	Lisle	DuPage	3Q2013	Sep-13	310			31	36	66	28	56	27	36	15													12
Wheaton 121	Wheaton	DuPage	3Q2013	Sep-13	306			76	138	0	31	15	18	3														13
Tapestry Naperville	Naperville	Naperville/Aurora	2Q2014	Apr-14	298						87	44	14	29	55	19	28											13
One Arlington	Arlington Hts.	Cook NW	3Q2014	Sep-14	214						30	21	10	64	39	22	15											10
Tapestry Glenview	Glenview	North Shore	3Q2014	Sep-14	290						20	21	37	57	33	26	19	23	24									10
Oaks of Vernon Hills	Vernon Hills	Lake	3Q2014	Sep-14	336						49	8	78	49	72	0	-8	34	22									11
Midtown Square	Glenview	North Shore	4Q2014	Dec-14	138							28	34	35	30													11
E2	Evanston	North Shore	1Q2015	Mar-15	356									146	139	11	27	18										23
Reserve at Glenview	Glenview	North Shore	1Q2015	May-15	239									43	43	17	45	20	14	9	-19	10	21	18				7
Woodview	Deerfield	North Shore	1Q2015	Jun-15	248									77	49	13	37	43	10									13
Amli Deerfield	Deerfield	North Shore	2Q2015	Aug-15	240										54	12	37	35	10	10	15	38	8					8
Park 205	Park Ridge	Cook NW	3Q2015	Oct-15	115										25	26	24	12	15									7
Northgate Crossing	Wheeling	Cook NW	4Q2015	Jan-16	288												40	41	35	35	36	42						13
Courthouse Square	Wheaton	DuPage	1Q2016	May-16	149												39	30	13	17	48							10
Orland Park Crossing	Orland Park	South Cook	1Q2016	May-16	231												40	59	35	39	17	11	5	8				10
Springs at Weber Road	Romeoville	Will	2Q2016	Aug-16	292													44	80	14	87	40						18
North 680	Schaumburg	Cook NW	1Q2017	Apr-17	180																23	52	14	21	52			11
Centrum Evanston	Evanston	North Shore	2Q2017	Jul-17	101																33	0	20	46				8
The Main	Evanston	North Shore	2Q2016	Oct-16	112													18	11	2	48	10	4	0	16	5		5
Springs at Orchard Rd.	North Aurora	Kane/Kendall	4Q2016	Dec-16	300															27	72	18	72	27	50	9	13	
Brook on Janes	Bolingbrook	Will	1Q2017	Mar-17	288																60	98	23	11	25	43	14	
Average Absorption Per Month - Stabilized Projects																												12
Projects in Lease-up																												
Northshore 770	Northbrook	North Shore	1Q2016	Jan-16	347													71	62	43	11	39	0	53	0	2	0	9
Apex 41	Lombard	DuPage	2Q2016	Oct-16	181													15	15	15	71	22	11	5	6	7		7
Station Boulevard	Aurora	Naperville/Aurora	3Q2015	Dec-16	425															23	53	62	60	40	51	19	15	
Metro 59	Aurora	Naperville/Aurora	2Q2016	Feb-17	232																16	65	22	2	18	19	8	
Uptown La Grange	La Grange	Cook South	1Q2017	Mar-17	254																32	54	46	30	7	37	11	
Hamilton Lakes	Itasca	Cook NW	2Q2017	Jun-17	297																	65	0	10	32	59	11	
The Emerson	Oak Park	Cook South	2Q2017	Aug-17	270																	27	35	24	93	46	15	
Residences of Wilmette	Wilmette	North Shore	3Q2017	Oct-17	75																							5
Prairie Winds of St. Charles	St. Charles	Kane	4Q2017	Dec-17	250																							30
Kelmscott Park	Lake Forest	North Shore	1Q2018	Jan-18	99																							6
Springs at South Elgin	South Elgin	Kane	1Q2018	Feb-18	300																							20
Deer Park Crossing	Deer Park	Lake	1Q2018	Mar-18	236																							16
Springs at Canterfield	West Dundee	Kane	2Q2018	May-18	260																							16
Atworth at Melody Farm	Vernon Hills	Lake	2Q2018	Jul-18	260																							25
Marq on Main	Lisle	DuPage	2Q2018	Aug-18	202																							16
Average Absorption Per Month - Projects in Lease-up																												14
Total						129	332	341	417	301	332	230	137	373	534	375	171	338	368	315	273	392	829	431	243	779	477	
Avg Bldg/Ctr						43.0	55.3	37.9	46.3	33.4	36.9	32.9	19.6	46.6	59.3	37.5	19.0	30.7	36.8	24.2	24.8	26.1	46.1	26.9	16.2	45.8	26.5	
Avg Monthly Absorption Per Development						14.3	18.4	12.6	15.4	11.1	12.3	11.0	6.5	15.5	19.8	12.5	6.3	10.2	12.3	8.1	8.3	8.7	15.4	9.0	5.4	15.3	8.8	

For absorption purposes, buildings are considered stabilized at 90% leased

Condominium Competition Survey

We have also been requested to explore the condominium potential for the Chestnut building as this building may instead be developed as a condominium rather than as a rental apartment building. The other two buildings are being planned for rental utilization.

As a first step, a survey of the condominium market was undertaken. The condominium competition survey is comprised of two components:

Resale product – existing condominium units in mid-rise and high-rise condominium building located in downtown Arlington Heights that were developed within the past 20 year. This survey provides current pricing for the alternatives currently existing in the downtown Arlington Heights market.

New product – proposed or newly constructed condominium buildings located in the suburbs in the Chicago Metropolitan Area, with a focus on locations in suburban downtowns. This survey provides insights into the types of units being developed in suburban downtowns throughout the MSA, the pricing of these units, and the sales absorption pace being achieved.

Condominium development halted abruptly 10 years ago with the market downturn. Projects which had been engaged in marketing at that time were either aborted (if pre-construction) or eventually finished if already under construction. Some of the buildings such as River 595 and Kingston Pointe in downtown Des Plaines were converted to rental utilization and are still operating as rental apartment buildings at the present time. Other buildings, such as the 119-unit Hamptons of Hinsdale townhome and condo project, were completed after sellout programs that lasted much longer than originally envisioned. In fact, the Hamptons of Hinsdale project was finally completed and sold out in 2017, 10 years after its marketing program had originally started.

Townhouse development has again been occurring throughout the Chicago MSA with several local and national builders actively and successfully developing townhouse projects. This is occurring in a wide variety of markets throughout the region. As townhomes frequently cater to a first-time buyer with product in the mid \$300,000 range and can be built in phases as units sell, this has been a popular for-sale product for both buyers and developers. Townhomes also don't require the long lead times that condominium buildings do, with the buyers being able to complete their sale without the delays that can occur with condominium development. Pre-sale requirements are not an issue in townhouse development similar to a large condominium building where it can take a developer one or two years to gather enough sales to break ground. Thus, the townhouse development has led the recovery, with condominium development still occurring on an extremely limited and sporadic basis.

On the following page is a summary of the resale pricing in downtown Arlington Heights along with a review of recent condominium development activity in the suburbs of Chicago. Geographically, the new condominium development is spread out across DuPage, Cook, Lake, and Kane Counties. None of this development activity has been occurring in the Northwest Cook submarket or on the North Shore, with the exception of Lake Forest. Even Evanston which had been such an active new

development condo market in the early 2000s and is currently undergoing extensive rental development currently has not experienced new condominium development in recent years. In addition, Naperville is a market where condominium development would have been expected given its highly popular and successful downtown district. While the 13 acres surrounding the Naperville Metra station are being planned by the Ryan Companies as a mixed-use development, the entitlement process has been lengthy and the plans for the residential component of the project have not been finalized. Thus, no new condominium product has been added to the Naperville market either.

The list of recent and proposed condominium projects in the suburban market is a rather short list as summarized below along with the resale activity in downtown Arlington Heights

Condominium Survey Overview

New Development Activity in the Suburban Chicago MSA and 2017/2018 Resales in Downtown Arlington Heights

Name of Development	Address	City	Type	Mktg Start	Year Delivered	Total # of Units	Units Sold	% Sold	# Mos. Mktg	Avg Price PSF
New Construction Condominiums Engaged in Marketing										
The Residences at Ashland	40 S. Ashland Ave	La Grange	New Construction	Oct-14	2017	17	14	82%	46	\$323
Marquis on Maple	940 Maple Ave	Downers Grove	New Construction	Jan-16	2017	55	20	36%	32	\$292
Kelmscott Park	1155 Kelmscott Way	Lake Forest	New Construction	Jul-16	2019	24	9	38%	25	\$415
District House	147 N. Euclid Ave	Oak Park	New Construction	Aug-16	2018	28	27	96%	24	\$414
Sterling Condos	10 W. Illinois St.	St. Charles	New Construction	Jan-17	2018	13	12	92%	18	\$178 shell
1101 Bonnie Brae	1101 Bonnie Brae	River Forest	New Construction	Early 2017	Proposed	15	0	0%	18	\$423
Foxford Station	4441 Wolf Road	Western Springs	New Construction	Mar-17	2019	28	9	32%	17	\$346
The Hill	105 S. Cottage Hill Ave.	Elmhurst	New Construction	Jun-18	Proposed	23	0	0%	2	\$424
One95 Elmhurst	195 N. Addison	Elmhurst	New Construction	Aug-18	Proposed	20		0%	n/a	n/a
New Construction Condominium Pipeline										
RF	Lake & Lathrop	River Forest	New Construction	TBD	Proposed	30				
One Winnetka	Elm and Lincoln	Winnetka	New Construction	TBD	Proposed	22				
The Butler	1900 Spring Road	Oak Brook	New Construction	TBD	Proposed	90				
Downtown Arlington Heights Resale Competition										
200 W. Campbell	200 W. Campbell	Arlington Hts	Resales		2000	91	91	100%		\$215
Metrolofts	10 S. Dunton	Arlington Hts	Resales		2007	55	55	100%		\$237
The Evergreen	77 S. Evergreen	Arlington Hts	Resales		2000	94	94	100%		\$207
Metropolis Place	1 S. Highland	Arlington Hts	Resales		2001	63	63	100%		\$208
44 N. Vail	44 N. Vail	Arlington Hts	Resales		2000	80	80	100%		\$230
201 N. Vail	201 N. Vail	Arlington Hts	Resales		1995	61	61	100%		\$178
Wing Street Residences	151 W. Wing	Arlington Hts	Resales		2003	61	61	100%		\$264

Condominium Survey Unit Sales Prices

New Development Activity in the Suburban Chicago MSA and 2017/2018 Resales in Downtown Arlington Heights

		One Bedroom			2BR/2BR+Den Range			Three Bedroom Range		
Name of Development	City	Price Range	SF Range	Price PSF Range	Price Range	SF Range	Price PSF Range	Price Range	SF Range	Price PSF Range
New Construction Condomininiums Engaged in Marketing										
The Residences at Ashland	La Grange							\$839,000-\$869,000	2,650	\$317-\$328
Marquis on Maple	Downers Grove				\$330,000-\$425,000	1,205-1,498	\$274-\$284	\$500,000-\$565,000	1,715-1,884	\$292-\$300
Kelmscott Park	Lake Forest				\$650,000-\$735,000	1,528-1,772	\$415-\$425	\$825,000-\$975,000	1,967-2,565	\$380-\$419
District House	Oak Park							\$559,900-\$972,950	1,700-2,056	\$329-\$473
Sterling Condos	St. Charles									
1101 Bonnie Brae	River Forest							\$799,900-\$1,070,000	1,900-2,550	\$419-\$421
Foxford Station	Western Springs				\$599,000-\$739,000	1,770-2.115	\$338-\$349	\$664,000-\$1,099,000	1,978-3,034	\$336-\$362
The Hill	Elmhurst				\$579,900-\$689,900	1,352-1,418	\$429-\$487	\$699,900-\$839,900	1,968	\$356-\$427
One95 Elmhurst	Elmhurst							\$799,900-\$1,100,000		
New Construction Condominium Pipeline										
RF	River Forest									
One Winnetka	Winnetka									
The Butler	Oak Brook									
Downtown Arlington Heights Resale Competition										
200 W. Campbell	Arlington Hts	\$227,500	1,216	\$187	\$325,000-\$340,000	1,431-1,628	\$203-233			
Metrolofts	Arlington Hts	\$183,000-\$257,000	964-1,063	\$190-\$242	\$270,000-\$305,000	1,265	\$213-\$233			
The Evergreen	Arlington Hts				\$280,500-\$425,000	1,591-1,800	\$176-\$236	\$595,000	3,100	\$192
Metropolis Place	Arlington Hts	\$218,000-\$225,000	1,000	\$225	\$279,995-\$330,000	1,388-1,500	\$202-\$220			
44 N. Vail	Arlington Hts	\$240,000-\$332,000	1,130-1,333	\$212-\$249	\$452,500-\$555,000	2,076-2,164	\$218-\$237			
201 N. Vail	Arlington Hts	\$160,000	1,000	\$160	\$272,000-\$355,000	1,703-1,850	\$160-\$192			
Wing Street Residences	Arlington Hts	\$248,000-\$270,000	975-1,100	\$225-\$277	\$465,000-\$745,000	1,700-3,100	\$240-\$274			

Resale Survey – Downtown Arlington Heights Condominium Buildings

Downtown Arlington Heights had experienced condominium development activity in the late 1990s and early 2000s, resulting in a numerous resale options for persons desiring to reside in a condominium unit downtown. All of these buildings are sold out but offer resales on an occasional basis. At the present time, the following units are listed for sale:

Arlington Heights Resale Survey – Downtown Condominium Buildings: Current Listings

Status	Address	Unit #	List Price	# Rms	Beds	Baths	Garage Spaces	SF	Price PSF	Days on Market
Contract	200 W Campbell	211	\$353,000	5	2	2	2	1,489	\$237	17
Listing	200 W Campbell	408	\$360,000	6	2	2	1	1,497	\$240	9
Listing	10 S Dunton	409	\$299,000	5	1	1	1	1,045	\$286	30
Listing	10 S Dunton	608	\$375,000	5	2	2	2	1,438	\$261	25
Listing	77 S Evergreen	408	\$270,000	5	2	2	1	1,235	\$219	85
Listing	77 S Evergreen	708	\$319,000	5	2	2	1	1,419	\$225	37
Listing	77 S Evergreen	802	\$424,900	6	2	2.5	1	2,000	\$212	58
Listing	77 S Evergreen	1201	\$650,000	7	3	3.5	2	2,500	\$260	332
Listing	44 N Vail	414	\$479,900	5	2	2	1	2,076	\$231	21
Contract	44 N Vail	415	\$485,000	5	2	2	2	2,080	\$233	313
Listing	151 W Wing	405	\$526,800	4	2	2.5	2	1,800	\$293	80
Contract	151 W Wing	905	\$675,000	8	2	2.5	2	2,187	\$309	38
Listing	151 W Wing	706	\$879,900	7	2	2.5	3	3,652	\$241	58

Source: MRED LLC, compiled by Integra Realty Resources - Chicago

Overall, the current listings of available inventory are averaging approximately \$250 PSF, with the inventory comprised primarily of two bedroom units. On the following pages is a summary of the 2017 and 2018ytd sales which have taken place in condominium building in downtown Arlington Heights which have been constructed in the past 20 years.

Arlington Heights Resale Survey – Downtown Condominium Buildings

2017 and 2018 Sales


Address	Unit #	Sale Price	# Rms	Beds	Baths	Garage Spaces	SF	Price PSF	Closed Date	Days on Market
200 W Campbell	501	\$227,500	4	1	1	1	1,216	\$187	2/28/2017	5
200 W Campbell	709	\$325,000	5	2	2	1	1,431	\$227	5/8/2017	39
200 W Campbell	712	\$336,450	5	2	2	1	1,447	\$233	8/28/2018	28
200 W Campbell	708	\$340,000	6	2	2	1	1,628	\$209	7/26/2017	6
200 W Campbell	709	\$365,000	5	2	2	1	n/a		7/13/2018	40
10 S Dunton	209	\$183,000	4	1	1	0	964	\$190	9/25/2017	147
10 S Dunton	303	\$220,000	3	1	1	0	824	\$267	8/11/2017	23
10 S Dunton	402	\$220,000	3	1	1	`	908	\$242	4/7/2017	5
10 S Dunton	606	\$223,000	3	1	1	0	836	\$267	5/1/2018	27
10 S Dunton	311	\$225,000	3	1	1	0	825	\$273	3/28/2018	154
10 S Dunton	302	\$230,000	3	1	1	0	n/a		4/5/2017	6
10 S Dunton	215	\$239,000	3	1	1	0	1,063	\$225	6/15/2017	33
10 S Dunton	607	\$257,000	4	1	1	0	1,063	\$242	8/10/2018	121
10 S Dunton	308	\$270,000	4	2	2	0	1,265	\$213	2/21/2018	57
10 S Dunton	304	\$275,000	4	1	2	0	n/a		8/16/2017	5
10 S Dunton	206	\$275,000	5	1	2	0	n/a		2/7/2017	4
10 S Dunton	604	\$284,000	4	1	2	0	1,217	\$233	2/28/2018	6
10 S Dunton	207	\$290,000	4	2	2	0	n/a		6/24/2018	54
10 S Dunton	407	\$305,000	4	2	2	0	n/a		6/27/2018	29
77 S Evergreen	304	\$280,500	5	2	2	1	1,591	\$176	7/20/2018	425
77 S Evergreen	608	\$289,000	5	2	2	1	n/a		2/15/2018	37
77 S Evergreen	606	\$305,000	5	2	2	1	1,482	\$206	7/16/2018	235
77 S Evergreen	1007	\$340,000	4	2	1.5	1	1,500	\$227	12/12/2017	70
77 S Evergreen	709	\$340,000	5	2	2	1	1,542	\$220	9/19/2017	62
77 S Evergreen	510	\$355,000	6	2	2.5	1	1,840	\$193	7/20/2018	345
77 S Evergreen	903	\$356,000	5	2	2	1	1,608	\$221	1/30/2017	61
77 S Evergreen	710	\$425,000	6	2	2.5	1	1,800	\$236	7/26/2017	11
77 S Evergreen	207	\$595,000	8	3	2.5	2	3,100	\$192	5/31/2017	4
1 S Highland	304	\$218,000	4	1	1	0	n/a		11/13/2017	12
1 S Highland	204	\$222,000	4	1	1	0	n/a		1/5/2018	5
1 S Highland	804	\$225,000	4	1	1	0	1,000	\$225	3/10/2017	26
1 S Highland	806	\$279,995	5	2	2	0	1,388	\$202	3/27/2017	4
1 S Highland	703	\$280,000	5	2	2	0	1,400	\$200	11/17/2017	133
1 S Highland	808	\$300,000	6	2	2	0	1,524	\$197	6/22/2017	2
1 S Highland	801	\$330,000	6	2	2	0	1,500	\$220	7/27/2018	5

Arlington Heights Resale Survey – Downtown Condominium Buildings

2017 and 2018 Sales – Continued

Address	Unit #	Sale Price	# Rms	Beds	Baths	Garage Spaces	SF	Price PSF	Closed Date	Days on Market
44 N Vail	404	\$240,000	4	1	1	1	1,130	\$212	3/2/2017	159
44 N Vail	404	\$274,750	4	1	1	1	1,130	\$243	8/11/2017	9
44 N Vail	608	\$332,000	5	1	1.5	1	1,333	\$249	5/4/2018	12
44 N Vail	203	\$452,500	5	2	2	1	2,076	\$218	5/29/2018	133
44 N Vail	314	\$470,000	5	2	2	1	2,076	\$226	7/31/2018	287
44 N Vail	511	\$512,000	5	1	2	2	2,164	\$237	4/27/2017	2
44 N Vail	704	\$555,000	6	2	2	2	n/a		5/1/2017	266
201 N Vail	302	\$160,000	4	1	1	1	1,000	\$160	5/31/2017	180
201 N Vail	401	\$272,000	5	2	2	1	1,703	\$160	6/22/2017	183
201 N Vail	601	\$294,000	5	2	2	1	1,703	\$173	6/15/2017	290
201 N Vail	707	\$345,000	5	2	2	1	1,842	\$187	6/8/2018	64
201 N Vail	707	\$345,000	5	2	2	1	1,842	\$187	6/29/2017	119
201 N Vail	807	\$355,000	5	2	2	1	1,850	\$192	2/23/2018	78
151 W Wing	301	\$248,000	4	1	1	1	1,100	\$225	5/26/2017	84
151 W Wing	302	\$251,500	3	1	1	1	950	\$265	6/1/2017	49
151 W Wing	310	\$255,000	4	1	1	2	1,100	\$232	2/6/2017	127
151 W Wing	809	\$270,000	4	1	1	1	975	\$277	4/20/2018	8
151 W Wing	705	\$465,000	5	2	2.5	2	1,700	\$274	8/18/2017	4
151 W Wing	507	\$490,000	4	2	2.5	2	1,800	\$272	12/27/2017	73
151 W Wing	304	\$635,900	6	2	2.5	1	2,600	\$245	5/31/2018	59
151 W Wing	308	\$690,000	7	2	2.5	2	3,096	\$223	4/3/2018	38
151 W Wing	508	\$745,000	6	2	2.5	2	3,100	\$240	11/27/2017	64

Source: MRED LLC, compiled by Integra Realty Resources - Chicago



As is typical of resale inventory, the condition and level of upgrading varies widely in these units. However, in general, the vast majority of these units offer finishes which are more dated than the types of finishes which would be included in new construction condominium units. In addition, the buildings' common area amenities are also much more modest than the finishes in a new construction residential building.

The following are the buildings which would comprise the resale competition for the subject units.



200 West Campbell is a condominium building which is located directly north of the subject site on Campbell. This 91-unit building was constructed in 2000. Recent resales of units have ranged from \$325,000 to \$365,000 for its 2BR units, with a 1BR sale at \$227,500. Its parking garage is within the building.



Metrolofts are located at 10 South Dunton, east of subject site. This 55-unit building was constructed in 2007 and is rather unique for the downtown Arlington Heights market with its hard loft finishes including exposed concrete, exposed pipes, exposed brick, and exposed ductwork. The building also features a modest exercise room, roof deck and community room.

This building does not have any on-site parking. Instead, the residents can rent parking spaces at the Vail Street garage for a monthly fee of \$40 per space. It is reported that the building is currently

60% owner occupied. Sales have been primarily ranging between \$220,000 and \$305,000, or the low to mid \$200s PSF.



77 South Evergreen is a 94 unit building which was built in 2000. Its amenities include a party room and exercise room along with a doorman. Parking is located within the building.

Sales have been ranging between \$280,000 and \$425,000 for the typical units in the building, with one 3,100 SF unit selling for \$595,000 in 2017.



Metropolis Place is located directly east of the subject property at 1 South Highland. It directly abuts the public garage on the south side. Constructed in 2001, this building has 63 units. It has loft finishes including an exposed concrete ceiling and spiral ductwork. Parking is available in the adjacent public garage for \$45 per month.

Sales have ranged from \$218,000 to \$225,000 for the one bedroom units and from \$280,000 to \$330,000 for the two bedroom units.



44 North Vail is located at the corner of Campbell and Vail, one block east of the subject site. Constructed in 2000, this building has approximately 80 units. Garage parking is contained within the building and the building also has concierge service daily.

This is a highly regarded building in downtown Arlington Heights and its sales have been ranging from \$240,000 to \$275,000 for 1BRs, with \$332,000 for a 1BR+Den unit, and \$452,500 to \$555,000 for its two bedroom units.



Developed in 1996, **201 North Vail** is the oldest downtown building included in the survey and the only building situated north of the Metra tracks. The building has 61 units and is unusual in that the condominium association currently does not allow pets or rentals. The building features a community room and patio space along with its own parking garage.

Recent sales prices have ranged from \$272,000 to \$355,000 for its two bedroom units and \$160,000 for a one bedroom unit. Overall, these prices have averaged \$178 PSF.



The Wing Street Residences at 151 W. Wing Street are located across from the Jewel, one block north of the subject property. This high-end building has 61 units and was developed in 2003. It offers concierge service on weekdays and has a garden area which can be used for dog walking. This is one of the most luxurious building in downtown Arlington Heights.

Sales have ranged from \$248,000 to \$270,000 for 1BR units with prices of \$490,000 to \$745,000 for 2BR units. Overall, sales in 2017 and 2018 have averaged \$264 PSF.

New Construction Condominium Survey – Developments throughout the Suburban MSA

As already discussed, there has been a very limited amount of new condominium development in the suburbs of Chicago in the past 10 years. Thus, the list of recent and proposed condominium projects in the suburban market is a rather short list as summarized below and followed by a description of each development:

Survey of New Suburban Condominium Development

Name of Development	Address	City	Type	Mktg Start	Year Delivered	Total # of Units	Units Sold	% Sold	# Mos. Mktg	Avg Price PSF
New Construction Condominiums Engaged in Marketing										
The Residences at Ashland	40 S. Ashland Ave	La Grange	New Construction	Oct-14	2017	17	14	82%	46	\$323
Marquis on Maple	940 Maple Ave	Downers Grove	New Construction	Jan-16	2017	55	20	36%	32	\$292
Kelmscott Park	1155 Kelmscott Way	Lake Forest	New Construction	Jul-16	2019	24	9	38%	25	\$415
District House	147 N. Euclid Ave	Oak Park	New Construction	Aug-16	2018	28	27	96%	24	\$414
Sterling Condos	10 W. Illinois St.	St. Charles	New Construction	Jan-17	2018	13	12	92%	18	\$178 shell
1101 Bonnie Brae	1101 Bonnie Brae	River Forest	New Construction	Early 2017	Proposed	15	0	0%	18	\$423
Foxford Station	4441 Wolf Road	Western Springs	New Construction	Mar-17	2019	28	9	32%	17	\$346
The Hill	105 S. Cottage Hill Ave.	Elmhurst	New Construction	Jun-18	Proposed	23	0	0%	2	\$424
One95 Elmhurst	195 N. Addison	Elmhurst	New Construction	Aug-18	Proposed	20		0%	n/a	n/a

Name of Development	City	2BR/2BR+Den Range			Three Bedroom Range		
		Price Range	SF Range	Price PSF Range	Price Range	SF Range	Price PSF Range
New Construction Condomininiums Engaged in Marketing							
The Residences at Ashland	La Grange				\$839,000-\$869,000	2,650	\$317-\$328
Marquis on Maple	Downers Grove	\$330,000-\$425,000	1,205-1,498	\$274-\$284	\$500,000-\$565,000	1,715-1,884	\$292-\$300
Kelmscott Park	Lake Forest	\$650,000-\$735,000	1,528-1,772	\$415-\$425	\$825,000-\$975,000	1,967-2,565	\$380-\$419
District House	Oak Park				\$559,900-\$972,950	1,700-2,056	\$329-\$473
Sterling Condos	St. Charles						
1101 Bonnie Brae	River Forest				\$799,900-\$1,070,000	1,900-2,550	\$419-\$421
Foxford Station	Western Springs	\$599,000-\$739,000	1,770-2.115	\$338-\$349	\$664,000-\$1,099,000	1,978-3,034	\$336-\$362
The Hill	Elmhurst	\$579,900-\$689,900	1,352-1,418	\$429-\$487	\$699,900-\$839,900	1,968	\$356-\$427
One95 Elmhurst	Elmhurst				\$799,900-\$1,100,000		

**None of these developments currently engaged in marketing offer one bedroom units.*

Projects engaged in marketing

From this survey of the properties which have been engaged in marketing, the following was noted about these new condominium developments:

- Locations are in affluent communities which support strong housing values.
- Locations are in suburban downtowns where residents can walk to restaurants, shops, and Metra.
- Project sizes are small.
- Unit sizes are large, with three bedroom units being the dominant unit type.
- One bedroom units are not being offered for sale, and only a limited number of projects have two bedroom units.
- Orientation of the developments is towards luxury product with high-end finishes and large amounts of outdoor space.
- Target buyer market is the empty nester who wants to downsize and stay living in the community.
- Several of the projects are priced around \$425 PSF, with the overall range extending from \$300 to \$425 PSF.
- While there are examples of projects which have had a brisk sales pace (such as the 28-unit District House in downtown Oak Park), sales velocity can still be a challenge even with small developments, as noted by the lengthy marketing periods for many of these projects.

Additional information on each of these projects follows:



40 South Ashland is a 17-unit new construction condominium building that was constructed in downtown LaGrange. Marketing started in October 2014, with first occupancies in the summer of 2017. Three units are currently unsold, all being 3BR/3 bath units priced from \$839,000 to \$869,000 with approximately 2,650 SF.

Sales in the building included 2BR units priced from \$400,000 to \$468,825 (1,250-1,645 SF), with 3BR units at \$700,000 to \$912,550 (2,306-2,667 SF), and two PH units at \$1,057,900-\$1,149,000 (3,171-3,628 SF). Overall, the units average approximately 2,400 SF with an average price of \$317 PSF. For at least a year, the property has had three units remaining unsold.

The Marquis at 940 Maple Avenue is a 55 unit new construction condominium building that was constructed on the southern edge of downtown Downers Grove. Marketing began in January 2016 with units ready for occupancy in November 2017. This project did not have a pre-sale requirement and started construction without the typical level of pre-sales. Sales have proceeded slowly and only 20 of the 55 units are reported to be sold after 2 ½ years of marketing. Current prices for the 2BR/2 bath units range from \$330,000 to \$425,000 (1,205-1,498 SF) and the 3BR/2.5 bath units range from \$500,000 to \$565,000 (1,715-1,884 SF). Overall, prices average approximately \$292 PSF.



The condominiums at **Kelmscott Park** are part of a larger mixed-use development in Lake Forest. Located at the far northern end of the downtown area, this redevelopment will include 111 rental apartments (3 buildings), 12 single family residences and two buildings with a total of 42 condominium buildings. Marketing for the first building with 24 units began in July 2016 with a sales center/trailer on

site. @ Properties has been marketing the units and the development team has been engaged in a professional marketing program, with 9 contracts to date. This 24 unit building is currently under construction, with occupancy planned to begin in February 2019. Two bedroom prices range from \$650,000 to \$735,000 (1,528-1,772 SF) with three bedrooms priced from \$825,000 to \$975,000 (1,967-2,565 SF). Prices average approximately \$415 PSF. This is a project being developed by Focus.

District House is a 28 unit building at 147 N. Euclid in downtown Oak Park which is an example of a successful condominium development. Marketing began in August 2016 and the units achieved good absorption. At the present time, 27 of the units have been sold, with only one remaining unit. Closings began in May 2018, and there have been 25 closings, with two additional units under contract. Units ranged from 1,700 to 2,056 SF, with all units being 3BR/2.5 bath units. Sales prices ranged from \$559,900 to \$972,950. The average size was 1,835 SF and the average sales price was \$414 PSF. All of the units were priced to include one garage parking space. This project was developed by Ranquist and marketed by Jameson.



In downtown St. Charles, **the Sterling Condominiums**, a small, 13 unit building, was constructed in 2018. It is an unusual building in that the units were sold in cold shell condition with no interior finishes. Completion was estimated to cost an additional \$110 PSF. At the present time, only one unit is available for sale. Units range from 1,400 to 2,100 SF, with one unit at 2,900 SF. Sales prices averaged \$178 PSF for units in unfinished condition.



A 15 unit condominium building is proposed for development in **River Forest at 1101 Bonnie Brae**.



pricing of \$423 PSF.

This development was approved by the village board in November 2016, with construction to start by February 2018. However, the developer reported that he was not able to obtain the five sales needed to meet his pre-sale requirement and obtained an extension from the village in February 2018. The units are priced from \$799,900 to \$1,070,000 and all contain 3BR/2 bath or 3BR/2.5 bath units. Unit sizes range from 1,900 to 2,550 SF, with average



Foxford Station is a 28 unit condominium building which is currently under construction in downtown Western Springs at 4441 Wolf Road. Marketing began in March 2017 and 9 units are currently under contract. Units range in price from \$599,000 to \$1,099,000, with unit sizes of 1,770 to 3,060 SF. Overall, the units average 2,216 SF in size with an average price of \$346 PSF. Included in the purchase price are two garage parking spaces. This project is being developed by Foxford Communities and marketed by Smothers Realty Group.



The Hill is a proposed 23 unit condominium building at **105 S. Cottage Hill** in downtown Elmhurst. Marketing began in June 2018 and no contracts have been reported. The units all consist of two bedrooms, although the larger units can alternatively provide 2BR+Den or three bedrooms. Sizes range from 1,352 to 1,418 SF for the two bedroom units (\$579,900-\$689,900) and the larger two bedroom units are 1,968 SF (priced from \$699,900 to \$839,900). Overall, the average unit size is 1,649 SF with an average price of \$424 PSF. This project is being developed by KLM Development Group and marketed by @ Properties.



One95Elmhurst is a 20 unit proposed condominium building at 195 N. Addison in downtown Elmhurst. The developer, DiCosola Group, and its marketing agent, Jameson, began running some teaser ads in the spring of 2018. Units will range in price from \$799,900 to \$1,100,000 with all units have 3BRs +Den, 2.5 baths. All of the units will be corner units and feature large terraces and 10' ceiling heights. Parking will consist of 21 standard spaces and 7 tandem spaces.

Condominium Pipeline – Proposed Projects which have not yet started marketing:

A 30 unit condominium building is proposed for development in downtown River Forest at Lake and Lathrop. Called RF, this project was recent approved and has begun running some teaser, pre-marketing ads. This 5-story building will contain 15,000 SF of ground floor retail with four stories of residences above. Each of the residences will contain 250 SF of outdoor space and the second floor units will have terraces with 1,200 SF each. Each unit will also have direct elevator entry into the residence. Units will range in size from 2BR to 4BR units with reported prices ranging from \$600,000 to \$1,400,000.



One Winnetka is a proposed mixed-use project which is planned for downtown Winnetka. In addition to 246 parking spaces (including commuter parking) and 32,000 SF of retail space, the project is planned to include 36 luxury rental apartments, 7 luxury for-sale townhomes, and 15 luxury condominium units. The developer has been engaged in the entitlement process since 2015 and has been revising the project in order to improve its financial feasibility. A reservation sales program started a few years ago but has not moved forward pending the revisions to the development plan.



Jupiter Realty is proposing the Butler, a 90 unit, 22 story high-rise luxury condominium building to be located at the edge of Oak Brook Shopping Center at 1900 Spring Road in Oak Brook. The developer reports that the typical floor plate will be six units per floor with units averaging 2,000 SF. Units are expected to range from approximately \$850,000 to \$2,000,000, with penthouse units topping that price.

This project is not yet entitled and is currently engaged in the approval process with the city.

Certification

We certify that, to the best of our knowledge and belief:

1. The statements of fact contained in this report are true and correct.
2. The reported analyses, opinions, and conclusions are limited only by the reported assumptions and limiting conditions, and are our personal, impartial, and unbiased professional analyses, opinions, and conclusions.
3. We have no present or prospective interest in the property that is the subject of this report and no personal interest with respect to the parties involved.
4. We have not performed any services, as an appraiser or in any other capacity, regarding the property that is the subject of this report within the three-year period immediately preceding acceptance of this assignment.
5. We have no bias with respect to the property that is the subject of this report or to the parties involved with this assignment.
6. Our engagement in this assignment was not contingent upon developing or reporting predetermined results.
7. Our compensation for completing this assignment is not contingent upon the development or reporting of a predetermined value or direction in value that favors the cause of the client, the amount of the value opinion, the attainment of a stipulated result, or the occurrence of a subsequent event directly related to the intended use of this appraisal.
8. Our analyses, opinions, and conclusions were developed, and this report has been prepared, in conformity with the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice as well as applicable state appraisal regulations.
9. The reported analyses, opinions, and conclusions were developed, and this report has been prepared, in conformity with the Code of Professional Ethics and Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice of the Appraisal Institute.
10. The use of this report is subject to the requirements of the Appraisal Institute relating to review by its duly authorized representatives.

11. Gail Lissner, SRA, CRE, made a personal inspection of the property that is the subject of this report.
12. No one provided significant real property appraisal assistance to the person(s) signing this certification.
13. We have experience in appraising properties similar to the subject and are in compliance with the Competency Rule of USPAP.
14. As of the date of this report, Gail Lissner, SRA, CRE has completed the continuing education program for Designated Members of the Appraisal Institute.



Gail Lissner, SRA, CRE
Certified General Real Estate Appraiser
Illinois Certificate # 553.001842, exp. 9/30/2019
Telephone: 312-565-3423
Email: glissner@irr.com

Assumptions and Limiting Conditions

This market study and any other work product related to this engagement are limited by the following standard assumptions, except as otherwise noted in the report:

1. The title is marketable and free and clear of all liens, encumbrances, encroachments, easements and restrictions. The property is under responsible ownership and competent management and is available for its highest and best use.
2. There are no existing judgments or pending or threatened litigation that could affect the value of the property.
3. There are no hidden or undisclosed conditions of the land or of the improvements that would render the property more or less valuable. Furthermore, there is no asbestos in the property.
4. The revenue stamps placed on any deed referenced herein to indicate the sale price are in correct relation to the actual dollar amount of the transaction.
5. The property is in compliance with all applicable building, environmental, zoning, and other federal, state and local laws, regulations and codes.
6. The information furnished by others is believed to be reliable, but no warranty is given for its accuracy.

This market study and any other work product related to this engagement are subject to the following limiting conditions, except as otherwise noted in the report:

1. The conclusions stated in our market study apply only as of the effective date of the market study, and no representation is made as to the effect of subsequent events.
2. No changes in any federal, state or local laws, regulations or codes (including, without limitation, the Internal Revenue Code) are anticipated.
3. No environmental impact studies were either requested or made in conjunction with this market study, and we reserve the right to revise or rescind any of the value opinions based upon any subsequent environmental impact studies. If any environmental impact statement is required by law, the market study assumes that such statement will be favorable and will be approved by the appropriate regulatory bodies.
4. Unless otherwise agreed to in writing, we are not required to give testimony, respond to any subpoena or attend any court, governmental or other hearing with reference to the property without compensation relative to such additional employment.
5. We have made no survey of the property and assume no responsibility in connection with such matters. Any sketch or survey of the property included in this report is for illustrative purposes only and should not be considered to be scaled accurately for size. The market study covers the property as described in this report, and the areas and dimensions set forth are assumed to be correct.

6. We accept no responsibility for considerations requiring expertise in other fields. Such considerations include, but are not limited to, legal descriptions and other legal matters such as legal title, geologic considerations such as soils and seismic stability; and civil, mechanical, electrical, structural and other engineering and environmental matters. Such considerations may also include determinations of compliance with zoning and other federal, state, and local laws, regulations and codes.
7. The market study shall be considered only in its entirety. No part of the market study shall be utilized separately or out of context.
8. Neither all nor any part of the contents of this report (especially any conclusions as to value, the identity of the appraisers, or any reference to the Appraisal Institute) shall be disseminated through advertising media, public relations media, news media or any other means of communication (including without limitation prospectuses, private offering memoranda and other offering material provided to prospective investors) without the prior written consent of the persons signing the report.
9. Information, estimates and opinions contained in the report and obtained from third-party sources are assumed to be reliable and have not been independently verified.
10. The current purchasing power of the dollar is the basis for the values stated in the market study; we have assumed that no extreme fluctuations in economic cycles will occur.
11. The values found herein are subject to these and to any other assumptions or conditions set forth in the body of this report but which may have been omitted from this list of Assumptions and Limiting Conditions.
12. The analyses contained in the report necessarily incorporate numerous estimates and assumptions regarding property performance, general and local business and economic conditions, the absence of material changes in the competitive environment and other matters. Some estimates or assumptions, however, inevitably will not materialize, and unanticipated events and circumstances may occur; therefore, actual results achieved during the period covered by our analysis will vary from our estimates, and the variations may be material.
13. The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) became effective January 26, 1992. We have not made a specific survey or analysis of the property to determine whether the physical aspects of the improvements meet the ADA accessibility guidelines. We claim no expertise in ADA issues, and render no opinion regarding compliance of the subject with ADA regulations. Inasmuch as compliance matches each owner's financial ability with the cost to cure the non-conforming physical characteristics of a property, a specific study of both the owner's financial ability and the cost to cure any deficiencies would be needed for the Department of Justice to determine compliance.
14. The market study is prepared for the exclusive benefit of the Client, its subsidiaries and/or affiliates. It may not be used or relied upon by any other party. All parties who use or rely upon any information in the report without our written consent do so at their own risk.
15. No studies have been provided to us indicating the presence or absence of hazardous materials on the subject property or in the improvements, and our valuation is predicated

- upon the assumption that the subject property is free and clear of any environment hazards including, without limitation, hazardous wastes, toxic substances and mold. No representations or warranties are made regarding the environmental condition of the subject property. Integra Realty Resources – Chicago, Integra Realty Resources, Inc., Integra Strategic Ventures, Inc. and/or any of their respective officers, owners, managers, directors, agents, subcontractors or employees (the “Integra Parties”), shall not be responsible for any such environmental conditions that do exist or for any engineering or testing that might be required to discover whether such conditions exist. Because we are not experts in the field of environmental conditions, the market study cannot be considered as an environmental assessment of the subject property.
16. The persons signing the report may have reviewed available flood maps and may have noted in the market study whether the subject property is located in an identified Special Flood Hazard Area. We are not qualified to detect such areas and therefore do not guarantee such determinations. The presence of flood plain areas and/or wetlands may affect the value of the property, and the value conclusion is predicated on the assumption that wetlands are non-existent or minimal.
 17. Integra Realty Resources – Chicago is not a building or environmental inspector. Integra Chicago does not guarantee that the subject property is free of defects or environmental problems. Mold may be present in the subject property and a professional inspection is recommended.
 18. The market study and conclusions assume the satisfactory completion of construction, repairs or alterations in a workmanlike manner.
 19. It is expressly acknowledged that in any action which may be brought against any of the Integra Parties, arising out of, relating to, or in any way pertaining to this engagement, the market study, and/or any other related work product, the Integra Parties shall not be responsible or liable for any incidental or consequential damages or losses, unless the market study was fraudulent or prepared with intentional misconduct.
 20. Integra Realty Resources – Chicago, an independently owned and operated company, has prepared the market study for the specific intended use stated elsewhere in the report. The use of the market study by anyone other than the Client is prohibited except as otherwise provided. Accordingly, the market study is addressed to and shall be solely for the Client’s use and benefit unless we provide our prior written consent. We expressly reserve the unrestricted right to withhold our consent to your disclosure of the market study or any other work product related to the engagement (or any part thereof including, without limitation, conclusions of value and our identity), to any third parties. Stated again for clarification, unless our prior written consent is obtained, no third party may rely on the market study (even if their reliance was foreseeable).
 21. The conclusions of this report are estimates based on known current trends and reasonably foreseeable future occurrences. These estimates are based partly on property information, data obtained in public records, interviews, existing trends, buyer-seller decision criteria in the current market, and research conducted by third parties, and such data are not always completely reliable. The Integra Parties are not responsible for these and other future

- occurrences that could not have reasonably been foreseen on the effective date of this assignment. Furthermore, it is inevitable that some assumptions will not materialize and that unanticipated events may occur that will likely affect actual performance. While we are of the opinion that our findings are reasonable based on current market conditions, we do not represent that these estimates will actually be achieved, as they are subject to considerable risk and uncertainty. Moreover, we assume competent and effective management and marketing for the duration of the projected holding period of this property.
22. All prospective value opinions presented in this report are estimates and forecasts which are prospective in nature and are subject to considerable risk and uncertainty. In addition to the contingencies noted in the preceding paragraph, several events may occur that could substantially alter the outcome of our estimates such as, but not limited to changes in the economy, interest rates, and capitalization rates, behavior of consumers, investors and lenders, fire and other physical destruction, changes in title or conveyances of easements and deed restrictions, etc. It is assumed that conditions reasonably foreseeable at the present time are consistent or similar with the future.

Addendum A

Qualifications

Gail Lissner, SRA, CRE

Experience

Managing Director for Integra Realty Resources
Former Vice President and Appraiser for Appraisal Research Counselors

Throughout her career, Ms. Lissner has focused on the housing/multi-family market, with a particular interest in condominium development, apartment development, and the condominium conversion/deconversion market. Gail's work with condominiums and apartments spans many decades, providing consulting services to the original Chicago condominium convertors in the 1970s, and expanding to work in the conversion market throughout the United States. Gail has produced a report on the condominium market on a quarterly basis since 1997 and is co-author of the Downtown Chicago Condominium Report, a quarterly report delineating development trends and condo pricing in Downtown Chicago. In Gail's consulting and valuation work for apartment and condominium developments, the scope of work ranges from site and building plan consultations at project inception to market and feasibility studies along with comprehensive appraisals. Her work includes both urban and suburban properties and also includes townhome and single family residential developments. Gail has also testified as an expert witness in a variety of housing matters. She is frequently quoted in the local and national media and is a frequent speaker at real estate industry events.

Professional Activities & Affiliations

Appraisal Institute: SRA Designation
The Counselors of Real Estate: CRE Designation
Board Member (2017-2020): State of IL Real Estate Appraisal Administration and Disciplinary Board

Village Trustee (2017-2021): Village of Glencoe Board of Trustees
President: Realty Club of Chicago (2016)
Vice President: Realty Club of Chicago (2015)
Secretary/Treasurer: Counselors of Real Estate Midwest Chapter (2009-2014)
Mentor: Goldie B Wolfe Miller Women Leaders in Real Estate Program at Roosevelt University (2008-2010)

Member: Commercial Real Estate Women (CREW)
Member: Real Estate Investment Association (REIA)
Member: Chicago Real Estate Council (CREC)
Member: Lambda Alpha International and Honorary Land Economics Society - Ely Chapter
Member: North Shore Barrington Board of Realtors
Crains Chicago Business: Named as one of Crains 20 Women to Watch 2008

Licenses

Illinois, Certified General Real Estate Appraiser - Gail Lissner, 553.001842, Expires September 2019

Illinois, Licensed Real Estate Managing Broker - Gail Lissner, 471.004757, Expires April 2019
Wisconsin, Certified General Real Estate Appraiser - Gail Lissner, 2282-10, Expires December 2019

Education

Bachelor of Arts from Washington University, 1972.
Phi Beta Kappa, 1972.

glessner@irr.com - 312-565-3423

Integra Realty Resources

Chicago

400 E Randolph
Suite 715
Chicago, IL 60601

T 312 565 0977
F 312 565 3436

irr.com



About IRR

Integra Realty Resources, Inc. (IRR) provides world-class commercial real estate valuation, counseling, and advisory services. Routinely ranked among leading property valuation and consulting firms, we are now the largest independent firm in our industry in the United States, with local offices coast to coast and in the Caribbean.

IRR offices are led by MAI-designated Senior Managing Directors, industry leaders who have over 25 years, on average, of commercial real estate experience in their local markets. This experience, coupled with our understanding of how national trends affect the local markets, empowers our clients with the unique knowledge, access, and historical perspective they need to make the most informed decisions.

Many of the nation's top financial institutions, developers, corporations, law firms, and government agencies rely on our professional real estate opinions to best understand the value, use, and feasibility of real estate in their market.

Local Expertise...Nationally!

irr.com

TINAGLIA ARCHITECTS • INC
814 W. NORTHWEST HIGHWAY
ARLINGTON HEIGHTS • IL 60004
VOICE • 847 253 0002
DATA • 847 253 3063
www.tinaglia.com

TINAGLIA
ARCHITECTS

CLIENT

CCH LLC
838 BUSSE HIGHWAY
PARK RIDGE, IL 60068

PROJECT

ARLINGTON 425
ARLINGTON HEIGHTS, ILLINOIS
MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT

DRAWING TITLE

ARCHITECTURAL
SITE PLAN


FILE NAME 3883-27P Site Plan
DRAWN BY RDL DATE 11.13.18

NO.	REVISED PER	DATE	BY
1	TRUCK TURNING REQ.	11.21.18	RDL
2	DESIGN DEVELOPMENT	11.27.18	RDL
3	DESIGN DEVELOPMENT	11.30.18	RDL
4	PRELIM D.C. MEETING	12.17.18	RDL
5	DESIGN DEVELOPMENT	12.20.18	RDL
6	DC & PC SUBMITTALS	1.14.19	RDL
7	REVISED PC SUBMITTAL	2.18.19	RDL
8	REVISED DC SUBMITTAL	3.1.19	RDL
9	REVISED PC SUBMITTAL	3.15.19	RDL

JOB NO. 388315

SHEET NO. OF 13 CS

PROFESSIONAL DESIGN FIRM LICENSE #184-002934



ARLINGTON 425: ARCHITECTURAL SITE PLAN
SCALE: 1" = 30'-0"


ARLINGTON 425

A NEW B-5 DISTRICT PUD DEVELOPMENT PRESENTED BY:
CCH LLC * 838 BUSSE HIGHWAY * PARK RIDGE, ILLINOIS

DRAWING INDEX


CS	COVER SHEET AND ARCHITECTURAL SITE PLAN
CP.1	CONTEXTUAL SITE PLAN
HL.1	44 S. HIGHLAND BUILDING FLOOR PLANS
HL.2	44 S. HIGHLAND BUILDING FLOOR PLANS
HL.3	44 S. HIGHLAND BUILDING ELEVATIONS
HL.4	44 S. HIGHLAND BUILDING ELEVATIONS
HL.5	44 S. HIGHLAND BUILDING SECTIONS
CA.1	225 W. CAMPBELL BUILDING FLOOR PLANS
CA.2	225 W. CAMPBELL BUILDING FLOOR PLANS
CA.3	225 W. CAMPBELL BUILDING ELEVATIONS
CA.4	225 W. CAMPBELL BUILDING ELEVATIONS
CH.1	33 S. CHESTNUT BUILDING FLOOR PLANS
CH.2	33 S. CHESTNUT BUILDING ELEVATIONS

© COPYRIGHT 2019 TINAGLIA ARCHITECTS, INC.



CONTEXTUAL SITE PLAN

SCALE: 1" = 50'-0"



TINAGLIA ARCHITECTS+INC
814 W. NORTHWEST HIGHWAY
ARLINGTON HEIGHTS-IL 60004
VOICE • 847 253 0002
DATA • 847 253 3063
www.tinaglia.com

TINAGLIA
ARCHITECTS

CLIENT

CCH LLC
838 BUSSE HIGHWAY
PARK RIDGE, IL 60068

PROJECT

ARLINGTON 425
ARLINGTON HEIGHTS, ILLINOIS
MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT

DRAWING TITLE


CONTEXTUAL
SITE PLAN

FILE NAME 3883-27P Site Plan
DRAWN BY RDL DATE 11.13.18

NO.	REVISED PER	DATE	BY
6	DC & PC SUBMITTALS	1.14.19	RDL
7	REVISED PC SUBMITTAL	2.18.19	RDL
8	REVISED DC SUBMITTAL	3.1.19	RDL
9	REVISED PC SUBMITTAL	3.15.19	RDL

JOB NO. 388315

SHEET NO.
OF 13 CP.1



ARLINGTON 435: AERIAL FIRE TRUCK DIAGRAM

SCALE: 1" = 30'-0"

TINAGLIA ARCHITECTS • INC
814 W. NORTHWEST HIGHWAY
ARLINGTON HEIGHTS • IL 60004
VOICE • 847 253 0002
DATA • 847 253 3063
www.tinaglia.com

TINAGLIA
ARCHITECTS

CLIENT

CCH LLC
838 BUSSE HIGHWAY
PARK RIDGE, IL 60068

PROJECT

ARLINGTON 425

ARLINGTON HEIGHTS, ILLINOIS
MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT

DRAWING TITLE


AERIAL FIRE
TRUCK DIAGRAM

FILE NAME 3883-27P Site Plan
DRAWN BY RDL DATE 3.15.19

NO.	REVISED PER	DATE	BY
9	REVISED PC SUBMITTAL	3.15.19	RDL


JOB NO. 388315

SHEET NO. OF AFD



FOUNDATION PLAN

24,451 SQ. FT. FOOTPRINT



FIRST FLOOR PLAN

10,244 SQ. FT.

ARLINGTON 425 DEVELOPMENT: CAMPBELL BUILDING FLOOR PLANS

SCALE: 1" = 20'-0"

© COPYRIGHT 2019 TINAGLIA ARCHITECTS, INC.

TINAGLIA ARCHITECTS • INC
814 W. NORTHWEST HIGHWAY
ARLINGTON HEIGHTS • IL 60004
VOICE • 847 253 0002
DATA • 847 253 3063
www.tinaglia.com

TINAGLIA
ARCHITECTS

CLIENT

CCH LLC
838 BUSSE HIGHWAY
PARK RIDGE, IL 60068

PROJECT

ARLINGTON 425
ARLINGTON HEIGHTS, IL 60005
MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT

DRAWING TITLE

CAMPBELL BLDG.
FLOOR PLANS


FILE NAME 3883-27P
DRAWN BY RDL DATE 11.13.18

NO.	REVISED PER	DATE	BY
4	PRELIM D.C. MEETING	12.17.18	RDL
6	DC & PC SUBMITTALS	1.14.19	RDL
7	REVISED PC SUBMITTAL	2.18.19	RDL
8	REVISED DC SUBMITTAL	3.1.19	RDL
9	REVISED PC SUBMITTAL	3.15.19	RDL

JOB NO. 388315


SHEET NO. OF 13 CA.1

PROFESSIONAL DESIGN FIRM LICENSE #184-002934




SECOND FLOOR PLAN

19,201 SQ. FT.



TYPICAL RESIDENTIAL FLOOR PLAN (FLOORS 3-9)

24,423 SQ. FT.



ROOF TERRACE PLAN

7,382 SQ. FT.

ARLINGTON 425 DEVELOPMENT: CAMPBELL BUILDING FLOOR PLANS

SCALE: 1" = 20'-0"

TINAGLIA ARCHITECTS • INC
814 W. NORTHWEST HIGHWAY
ARLINGTON HEIGHTS • IL 60004
VOICE • 847 253 0002
DATA • 847 253 3063
www.tinaglia.com

TINAGLIA
ARCHITECTS

CLIENT

CCH LLC
838 BUSSE HIGHWAY
PARK RIDGE, IL 60068

PROJECT

ARLINGTON 425

ARLINGTON HEIGHTS, IL 60005
MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT

DRAWING TITLE

CAMPBELL BLDG.
FLOOR PLANS

FILE NAME

3883-2TP

DRAWN BY

RDL

DATE

11.13.18

NO.

REVISED PER

DATE

BY

4

PRELIM D.C. MEETING

12.17.18

RDL

5

ADD 26th UNIT PER FLOOR

1.8.19

RDL

6

DC & PC SUBMITTALS

1.14.19

RDL

7

REVISED PC SUBMITTAL

2.18.19

RDL

8

REVISED DC SUBMITTAL

3.1.19

RDL

9

REVISED PC SUBMITTAL

3.15.19

RDL

JOB NO.


388315

SHEET NO.
OF 13

CA.2


© COPYRIGHT 2019 TINAGLIA ARCHITECTS, INC.

PROFESSIONAL DESIGN FIRM LICENSE #184-002934



ARLINGTON 425: 225 W. CAMPBELL NORTH ELEVATION

SCALE: 1" = 15'-0"



ARLINGTON 425: 225 W. CAMPBELL EAST ELEVATION

SCALE: 1" = 15'-0"

ARLINGTON 425: 225 W. CAMPBELL WEST ELEVATION

SCALE: 1" = 15'-0"

TINAGLIA ARCHITECTS • INC
814 W. NORTHWEST HIGHWAY
ARLINGTON HEIGHTS • IL 60004
VOICE • 847 253 0002
DATA • 847 253 3063
www.tinaglia.com

TINAGLIA
ARCHITECTS

CLIENT

CCH LLC
838 BUSSE HIGHWAY
PARK RIDGE, IL 60068

PROJECT

ARLINGTON 425

ARLINGTON HEIGHTS, IL 60005
MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT

DRAWING TITLE

CAMPBELL BLDG.
ELEVATIONS


FILE NAME	3883-27P	DATE	11.13.18
DRAWN BY	RDL	BY	
NO.	REVISED PER	DATE	BY
4	PRELIM D.C. MEETING	12.17.18	RDL
6	DC & PC SUBMITTALS	1.14.19	RDL
7	REVISED PC SUBMITTAL	2.18.19	RDL
8	REVISED DC SUBMITTAL	3.1.19	RDL
9	REVISED PC SUBMITTAL	3.15.19	RDL

JOB NO. 388315

SHEET NO. **CA.3**
OF 13


PROFESSIONAL DESIGN FIRM LICENSE #184-002934

© COPYRIGHT 2019 TINAGLIA ARCHITECTS, INC.




ARLINGTON 425: 225 W. CAMPBELL SOUTH ELEVATION

SCALE: 1" = 15'-0"



ARLINGTON 425: 225 W. CAMPBELL DRIVE-THRU UNDERPASS LOOKING WEST SECTION ELEVATION

SCALE: 1" = 15'-0"



ARLINGTON 425: 225 W. DRIVE-THRU UNDERPASS LOOKING EAST SECTION ELEVATION

SCALE: 1" = 15'-0"

TINAGLIA ARCHITECTS • INC
814 W. NORTHWEST HIGHWAY
ARLINGTON HEIGHTS • IL 60004
VOICE • 847 253 0002
DATA • 847 253 3063
www.tinaglia.com

TINAGLIA
ARCHITECTS

CLIENT

CCH LLC
838 BUSSE HIGHWAY
PARK RIDGE, IL 60068

PROJECT

ARLINGTON 425
ARLINGTON HEIGHTS, IL 60005
MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT

DRAWING TITLE


CAMPBELL BLDG.
ELEVATIONS

FILE NAME 3883-27P			
DRAWN BY RDL		DATE 11.13.18	
NO.	REVISED PER	DATE	BY
4	PRELIM D.C. MEETING	12.17.18	RDL
5	ADD 26th UNIT PER FLOOR	1.8.19	RDL
6	DC & PC SUBMITTALS	1.14.18	RDL
7	REVISED PC SUBMITTAL	2.18.19	RDL
8	REVISED DC SUBMITTAL	3.1.19	RDL
9	REVISED PC SUBMITTAL	3.15.19	RDL

JOB NO. 388315


SHEET NO. OF 13 CA.4

PROFESSIONAL DESIGN FIRM LICENSE #184-002934



TYPICAL 7th THROUGH 12th LEVEL RESIDENTIAL FLOOR PLAN

19,485 SQ. FT.




6th LEVEL PARKING GARAGE PLAN


30,323 SQ. FT.

ARLINGTON 425: 44 S. HIGHLAND BUILDING FLOOR PLANS

SCALE: 1" = 20'-0"



ROOF PLAN



AMENITY / ROOF TERRACE LEVEL FLOOR PLAN

12,844 SQ. FT.

TINAGLIA ARCHITECTS • INC
814 W. NORTHWEST HIGHWAY
ARLINGTON HEIGHTS • IL 60004
VOICE • 847 253 0002
DATA • 847 253 3063
www.tinaglia.com

TINAGLIA
ARCHITECTS

CLIENT

CCH LLC
838 BUSSE HIGHWAY
PARK RIDGE, IL 60068

PROJECT

ARLINGTON 425

ARLINGTON HEIGHTS, IL 60005
MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT

DRAWING TITLE

HIGHLAND BLDG.
FLOOR PLANS

FILE NAME

3883-27P

DRAWN BY

RDL

DATE

11.13.18

NO.

REVISED PER

DATE

BY

2

DESIGN DEVELOPMENT

11.27.18

RDL

4

PRELIM D.C. MEETING

12.17.18

RDL

6

DC & PC SUBMITTALS

1.14.19

RDL

7

REVISED PC SUBMITTAL

2.18.19

RDL

8

REVISED DC SUBMITTAL

3.1.19

RDL

9

REVISED PC SUBMITTAL

3.15.19

RDL

JOB NO.


388315

SHEET NO.
OF 13

HL.2


PROFESSIONAL DESIGN FIRM LICENSE #184-002934

© COPYRIGHT 2019 TINAGLIA ARCHITECTS, INC.



ARLINGTON 425: 44 S. HIGHLAND WEST ELEVATION

SCALE: 1" = 15'-0"



ARLINGTON 425: 44 S. HIGHLAND NORTH ELEVATION

SCALE: 1" = 15'-0"

TINAGLIA ARCHITECTS-INC
814 W. NORTHWEST HIGHWAY
ARLINGTON HEIGHTS-IL 60004
VOICE • 847 253 0002
DATA • 847 253 3063
www.tinaglia.com

TINAGLIA
ARCHITECTS

CLIENT

CCH LLC

838 BUSSE HIGHWAY
PARK RIDGE, IL 60068

PROJECT

ARLINGTON 425

ARLINGTON HEIGHTS, IL 60005
MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT

DRAWING TITLE

HIGHLAND BLDG.
ELEVATIONS


FILE NAME	3883-27P		
DRAWN BY	RDL	DATE	11.13.18
NO.	REVISED PER	DATE	BY
4	PRELIM D.C. MEETING	12.17.18	RD
6	DC & PC SUBMITTALS	1.14.19	RD
7	REVISED PC SUBMITTAL	2.18.19	RD
8	REVISED DC SUBMITTAL	3.1.19	RD
9	REVISED PC SUBMITTAL	3.15.19	RD

JOB NO. 388315

SHEET NO. HL.3
OF 13


PROFESSIONAL DESIGN FIRM LICENSE #184-002934

© COPYRIGHT 2019 TINAGLIA ARCHITECTS, INC.



ARLINGTON 425: 44 S. HIGHLAND EAST ELEVATION

SCALE: 1" = 15'-0"



ARLINGTON 425: 44 S. HIGHLAND SOUTH ELEVATION

SCALE: 1" = 15'-0"

TINAGLIA ARCHITECTS • INC
814 W. NORTHWEST HIGHWAY
ARLINGTON HEIGHTS • IL 60004
VOICE • 847 253 0002
DATA • 847 253 3063
www.tinaglia.com

TINAGLIA
ARCHITECTS

CUENT

CCH LLC

838 BUSSE HIGHWAY
PARK RIDGE, IL 60068

PROJECT

ARLINGTON 425

ARLINGTON HEIGHTS, IL 60005
MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT

DRAWING TITLE

HIGHLAND BLDG.
ELEVATIONS

FILE NAME 3883-27P

DRAWN BY RDL DATE 11.13.18

NO.	REVISED PER	DATE	BY
4	PRELIM D.C. MEETING	12.17.18	RDL
6	DC & PC SUBMITTALS	1.14.19	RDL
7	REVISED PC SUBMITTAL	2.18.19	RDL
8	REVISED DC SUBMITTAL	3.1.19	RDL
9	REVISED PC SUBMITTAL	3.15.19	RDL


JOB NO. 388315

SHEET NO.
OF 13

HL.4


© COPYRIGHT 2019 TINAGLIA ARCHITECTS, INC.

PROFESSIONAL DESIGN FIRM LICENSE #184-002934



ARLINGTON 425: 44 S. HIGHLAND BUILDING NORTH SOUTH SECTION LOOKING EAST

SCALE: 1" = 15'-0"



ARLINGTON 425: 44 S. HIGHLAND BUILDING NORTH SOUTH SECTION LOOKING EAST

SCALE: 1" = 15'-0"

TINAGLIA ARCHITECTS-INC
814 W. NORTHWEST HIGHWAY
ARLINGTON HEIGHTS-IL 60004
VOICE • 847 253 0002
DATA • 847 253 3063
www.tinaglia.com

TINAGLIA
ARCHITECTS

CCH LLC
838 BUSSE HIGHWAY
PARK RIDGE, IL 60068

ARLINGTON 425
ARLINGTON HEIGHTS, IL 60005
MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT


HIGHLAND BLDG.
SECTIONS

FILE NAME	3883-27P	DATE	11.27.18
DRAWN BY	RDL	DATE	11.27.18
NO.	REVISED PER	DATE	BY
4	PRELIM D.C. MEETING	12.17.18	RDL
6	DC & PC SUBMITTALS	1.14.18	RDL
7	REVISED PC SUBMITTAL	2.18.19	RDL
8	REVISED DC SUBMITTAL	3.1.19	RDL
9	REVISED PC SUBMITTAL	3.15.19	RDL

JOB NO. 388315


SHEET NO. HL.5
OF 13

PROFESSIONAL DESIGN FIRM LICENSE #184-002934




ROOF / ROOFTOP TERRACE PLAN

1,916 SQ. FT.




TYPICAL 2nd, 3rd & 4th RESIDENTIAL LEVEL FLOOR PLANS

17,148 SQ. FT.



FIRST FLOOR PLAN

17,112 SQ. FT.



UNDERGROUND PARKING GARAGE PLAN

30,974 SQ. FT. FOOTPRINT

ARLINGTON 425 DEVELOPMENT: CHESTNUT BUILDING FLOOR PLANS

SCALE: 1" = 20'-0"

TINAGLIA ARCHITECTS+INC
814 W. NORTHWEST HIGHWAY
ARLINGTON HEIGHTS • IL 60004
VOICE • 847 253 0002
DATA • 847 253 3063
www.tinaglia.com

TINAGLIA
ARCHITECTS

CLIENT

CCH LLC

838 BUSSE HIGHWAY
PARK RIDGE, IL 60068

PROJECT

ARLINGTON 425

ARLINGTON HEIGHTS, IL 60005
MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT

DRAWING TITLE

CHESTNUT BLDG.
FLOOR PLANS

FILE NAME 3883-27P

DRAWN BY RDL DATE 11.13.18


NO.	REVISED PER	DATE	BY
4	PRELIM D.C. MEETING	12.17.18	KGB
5	ADD 14th UNIT PER FLOOR	1.8.19	RDL
6	DC & PC SUBMITTALS	1.14.19	RDL
7	REVISED PC SUBMITTAL	2.18.19	RDL
8	REVISED DC SUBMITTAL	3.1.19	RDL
9	REVISED PC SUBMITTAL	3.15.19	RDL

JOB NO. 388315

SHEET NO. CH.1
OF 13

PROFESSIONAL DESIGN FIRM LICENSE #184-002934

© COPYRIGHT 2019 TINAGLIA ARCHITECTS, INC.



#	REVISION	DATE

ARLINGTON 425

ARLINGTON 42
VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS
COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS
PROJECT NO:3514.02

CCH, L.L.C.
7458 N. HARLEM AVE.
CHICAGO, IL 60631
PH: 773-775-5400
FAX: 773-775-4433

TINAGLIA ARCHITECTS, INC.
814 W. NORTHWEST HIGHWAY
ARLINGTON HEIGHTS, IL 60004
PH: 847-253-0002

COUNTY COOK
CITY, TOWNSHIP VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS, WHEELING TOWNSHIP
SEC. & 1/4 SEC. NO. SE 1/4 OF SEC. 30, T42N, R11E

ELEVATION:

INDEX

LOCATION MAP



**ARLINGTON 425
DEVELOPMENT**



9575 W. Higgins Road, Suite 700, Rosemont, Illinois 60018
Phone: (847) 696-4060 Fax: (847) 696-4065

CONSULTING ENGINEERS
SITE DEVELOPMENT ENGINEERS
LAND SURVEYORS

**SPACECO INC.**



FILENAME:
3514.02P-TITLE

DATE: 09/21/18

JOB NO.
3514.02

SHEET
D. 06

1 OF 5



BENCHMARK
ELEVATION = 693.47'
DESCRIPTION: " " MARKER X ON NORTHEAST PART OF
FLANGE IN BETWEEN BOLTS OF THE FIRE HYDRANT AT THE
NORTHWEST CORNER OF HIGHLAND & SIGNAL STREETS.

LEGEND			
	STORM SEWER		SANITARY MANHOLE
	SANITARY SEWER		STORM MANHOLE
	COMBINED SEWER		CATCH BASIN
	WATER MAIN		INLET
	GAS MAIN		FLARED END SECTION
	UNDERGROUND TELEPHONE LINE		ELECTRIC MANHOLE
	UNDERGROUND ELECTRIC LINE		TELEPHONE MANHOLE
	CATV		ELECTRIC UPRIGHT
	OVERHEAD WIRE ON UTILITY POLES		CABLE TV UPRIGHT
	FIBER OPTIC LINE		FIRE HYDRANT
	FENCE		VALVE AND VAULT
	GUARDRAIL		WATER VALVE
	EDGE OF WATER		B BOX
	WETLAND LIMITS		WELL
			AUXILIARY VALVE
			GAS VALVE
			HAND HOLE
			STREET LIGHT
			UTILITY POLE
			TRAFFIC SIGNAL
			SPRINKLER HEAD
			MAILBOX
			SIGN
			UNIDENTIFIED MANHOLE
			SPOT ELEVATION
			RIGHT-OF-WAY MONUMENT
			DISC
			IRON / STEEL ROD
			IRON PIPE
			CUT CROSS
			3/4" / 1/2" MAIL
			RAILROAD SPIKE
			SOIL BORING
			TREE WITH SIZE
			FIR TREE WITH SIZE
			BUSH
			ASPHALT
			CONCRETE
			GRAVEL


NOTE:
UNDERGROUND UTILITIES ARE SHOWN BY USING PHYSICAL EVIDENCE FOUND ON THE SURFACE AND/OR FROM UTILITY COMPANY FIELD STAKES AND, THEREFORE, THEIR LOCATIONS ARE APPROXIMATE AND SUSPECTED AND MAY NOT BE COMPLETELY ACCURATE. FOR MORE ACCURATE LOCATION, FIELD EXCAVATE.
PIPE FLOW DIRECTIONS, IF SHOWN, ARE BASED ON FIELD INVERT ELEVATIONS UNLESS EXISTING PLANS INDICATE OTHERWISE. IN WHICH CASE THE EXISTING PLAN FLOW DIRECTION IS SHOWN.
LAST DAY OF FIELD WORK: SEPT. 23, 2002
THE BOUNDARY SHOWN IS FROM AN A.L.T.A. / A.C.S.M. LAND TITLE SURVEY COMPLETED BY CE DESIGN, LTD. DATED OCTOBER 25, 1995
EXISTING ON-SITE IMPROVEMENTS NOT SHOWN AT REQUEST OF CLIENT.



EXISTING CONDITIONS
ARLINGTON 425
ARLINGTON HEIGHTS, ILLINOIS

CONSULTING ENGINEERS
SITE DEVELOPMENT ENGINEERS
LAND SURVEYORS
9575 W. Higgins Road, Suite 700,
Rosemont, Illinois 60018
Phone: (847) 696-4060 Fax: (847) 696-4065



FILENAME:
3514.02P-SE03
DATE:
09/21/18
JOB NO.
3514.02
SHEET
P-EC
2 OF 5





- LEGEND**
- F/F FINISHED FLOOR
 - T/F FINISHED FLOOR
 - LOCAL DRAINAGE
 - 100-YEAR OVERLAND FLOW ROUTE
 - LOCAL DRAINAGE DIVIDE
 - TOP OF CURB
EDGE OF PAVEMENT
 - TOP OF WALL
BOTTOM OF WALL

NO.	DATE	REMARKS

NO.	DATE	REMARKS
4	03/14/19	REVISED SITE PLAN FROM ARCHITECT
3	02/18/19	REVISED SITE PLAN FROM ARCHITECT
2	01/16/19	REVISED SITE PLAN FROM ARCHITECT
1	11/08/18	REVISED SITE LAYOUT

PRELIMINARY GRADING PLAN

ARLINGTON 425

ARLINGTON HEIGHTS, ILLINOIS

CONSULTING ENGINEERS
SITE DEVELOPMENT ENGINEERS
LAND SURVEYORS

9575 W. Higgins Road, Suite 700,
 Rosemont, Illinois 60018
 Phone: (847) 676-4060 Fax: (847) 676-4065




FILENAME:
3514.02P-GR

DATE:
09/21/18

JOB NO.
3514.02

SHEET
P-GR
4 OF 5



S. HIGHLAND AVENUE

PARKING
GARAGE

LIGHTING LEGEND

- R ROADWAY LIGHTING
- ES RELOCATE EXISTING STREET LIGHTING
- S STREET LIGHTING
- O ORNAMENTAL LIGHTING
- N NICHE LIGHTING
- W WALL WASH LIGHTING
- ▲▲ TREE UPLIGHTING

W. CAMPBELL STREET

225 W.
CAMPBELL

44 S.
HIGHLAND

COURTYARD
LIGHTING


225 W.
CAMPBELL

33 S.
CHESTNUT

S. CHESTNUT AVENUE





Lighting Plan Arlington 425 Arlington Heights, Illinois









ISSUE DATE: March 14, 2019
All drawings are preliminary and subject to change.
© 2019 Hitchcock Design Group

PREPARED FOR:
CCH LLC







In Progress Details Included For Reference Only



In Progress Details Included For Reference Only

1 Ornamental Fence




NOTES:
Adjustment panels may be selectively cut at rail ends to fit on-site as specified. All exposed metal edges to be treated and finished per specifications.


Center portion of adjustment panel between posts as shown.

See notes Detail 1, Sheet L401 Similar unless noted otherwise.


2 Ornamental Fence Adjustable Panel




DETAIL: UNIT PAVER SIDEWALK PATTERN





DETAIL: BRICK PAVER SIDEWALK SECTION




DETAIL: BENCH PAD




DETAIL: BRICK PAVER SIDEWALK PLAN




DETAIL: ORNAMENTAL LIGHT FIXTURE FOU




ATTENTION: STERNBERG ORNAMENTAL LIGHT FIXTURE




DETAIL: TREE PIT SECTION



3 Ornamental Metal Gate




1 Concrete Planter Curb




5 Unit Pavers


In Progress Details Included For Reference Only




3 Bench Receptacle Attachment




4 Planter GFRC




7 Brick Wall



DuMor, inc.
P.O. Box 142 Mifflintown, PA 17059-0142




DuMor, inc.
P.O. Box 142 Mifflintown, PA 17059-0142




DuMor, inc.
P.O. Box 142 Mifflintown, PA 17059-0142

(A) ORDER:
CENTER
ARM
REST
(B) ANCHOR
BENCH w/
STAINLESS
STEEL
BOLTS
BENCH
(Not to Scale)





Existing Street Lighting



Ornamental Lighting



Bollard Lighting



Bollard Lighting



Wall Wash Lighting / Tree Uplighting



Wall Wash Lighting / Tree Uplighting



Niche Lighting



Courtyard Lighting



Wall Pack



Niche Lighting




Lighting Options

Arlington 425


Arlington Heights, Illinois

PREPARED FOR:
CCH LLC

ISSUE DATE: February 18, 2019
All drawings are preliminary and subject to change.
© 2019 Hitchcock Design Group



AREA TABLE		
	SQ FT	ACRES
LOT 1	119,753	2.749
CHESTNUT AVE DEDICATION	3,572	0.082
HIGHLAND AVE DEDICATION	1,612	0.037
TOTAL	124,937	2.868




PRELIMINARY PLAT OF ARLINGTON 425

A RESUBDIVISION OF A SUBDIVISION OF LOTS 26, 27, 28 AND 29, IN
THE ASSESSORS DIVISION OF SECTION 30, TOWNSHIP 42 NORTH, RANGE
11 EAST OF THE THIRD PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, IN COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS

PROPERTY DESCRIPTION:
LOTS 1 TO 11 AND LOTS 18 TO 23 IN BLOCK 2 IN A SUBDIVISION OF
LOTS 26, 27, 28 AND 29 IN ASSESSORS DIVISION OF SECTION 30,
TOWNSHIP 42 NORTH, RANGE 11, EAST OF THE THIRD PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN,
IN COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS.

P.I.N. 03-30-425-030-0000
03-30-425-015-0000
03-30-425-016-0000
03-30-425-017-0000
03-30-425-018-0000
03-30-425-019-0000
03-30-425-020-0000
03-30-425-024-0000
03-30-425-025-0000
03-30-425-026-0000
03-30-425-027-0000
03-30-425-028-0000



PREPARED FOR:
CCH LLC
838 BUSSE HIGHWAY
PARK RIDGE, ILLINOIS 60068

OWNER:
ALPHA TRUST
838 BUSSE HIGHWAY
PARK RIDGE, ILLINOIS 60068

SUBDIVIDER:
CCH LLC
838 BUSSE HIGHWAY
PARK RIDGE, ILLINOIS 60068

FOR REVIEW
PURPOSES ONLY

REVISIONS:
02/08/2019
02/15/2019
03/14/2019



CONSULTING ENGINEERS
SITE DEVELOPMENT ENGINEERS
LAND SURVEYORS

9575 W. Higgins Road, Suite 700,
Rosemont, Illinois 60018
Phone: (847) 696-4060 Fax: (847) 696-4065

DATE: 09/04/2018
JOB NO: 3514.02
FILENAME:
3514.02PRE-01
SHEET
1 OF 1



**Village of Arlington Heights, IL
Department of Building & Life Safety**

Fire Safety Division

Date: 3/21/2019

P.C. Number: 19-001 Round 3

Project Name: Planned Unit Development – Arlington 425

Project Location: Block 425

Planning Department Contact: Sam Hubbard, Planning and Community Development

General Comments:

The information provided is conceptual only and subject to a formal plan review.

1. Confirm that the length of the fire lane on the west side of 44 S. Highland is acceptable to the Fire Chief.
2. To confirm, brick pavers of any kind are not an approved surface for fire lanes.
3. Provide the proposed width of the travel lane exiting onto West Campbell Street.

Date 03-21-19

Reviewed By:


Fire Safety Supervisor

RECEIVED
MAR 21 2019
PLANNING & COMMUNITY
DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

PLAN COMMISSION PC #19-001
Arlington 425
PUD, Preliminary Plat of Subdivision, Rezoning from R-1 to B-5,
LUV for Apartment Building, Variations
Round 3

109. The petitioner's response to Comment No. 75 is acceptable.
110. The petitioner's response to Comment No. 76 is noted. The widening of the fire lane has addressed the issues with the maneuvers through the site. Although pavement widths for one way entrances and exits are 14 ft maximum, this conflicts with the required fire lane width. The one way traffic flow through the site can be addressed with striping and any necessary signage. The "no parking fire lane" crosshatching is currently shown on the architectural site plan. The striping to designate the one way lane width and any necessary signage shall be shown on the civil site plans. This can be addressed at final engineering.
111. The petitioner's response to Comment Nos. 77 thru 79 is acceptable.
112. The petitioner's response to Comment No. 80 is noted.
- a. Information was not provided to support the concrete layer coefficient of 0.50 for the structural number of the brick pavers. Provide additional information from the manufacturer and/or a Structural Engineer verifying that the layer coefficient for the heavy duty pavers is equivalent to the concrete layer coefficient. It should also be clarified that the structural number applies to both the permeable pavers and the brick pavers in the fire lane. This can be addressed at final engineering.
 - b. The heavy duty pavement section must also be shown on the fire truck maneuver exhibits, on the geometric plan and the details. Revise the plans accordingly. This can be addressed at final engineering.
 - c. Provide the cross section for the underground parking and fire lane. This can be addressed at final engineering.
 - d. The reinforced lawn for the fire lane is not acceptable.
113. The petitioner's response to Comment No. 81 is noted. Per Comment No. 112, a reinforced lawn for the fire lane is not acceptable.
114. The petitioner's response to Comment Nos. 82 and 83 are acceptable.
115. The petitioner's response to Comment No. 84 is noted. Per prior comments, it would be preferred to adjust the grades to eliminate the retaining wall. In no case shall the wall exceed 3 ft in height.
116. The petitioner's response to Comment No. 85 is acceptable.
117. The petitioner's response to Comment No. 86 is noted.
- a. The petitioner's response does not address the underground parking for the Chestnut Ave building which will be located under the proposed fire lane between the Chestnut Ave building and Highland Ave building. Additional information shall be provided to address the respective phases of construction to verify that the fire lane will not be affected during Phase II. Please also see Comment No. 77 from the Planning Department.
 - b. Dimensions shall be placed on the staging plan to insure that there is adequate space for proposed traffic flow.

118. The petitioner's response to Comment No. 87 is acceptable.
119. The petitioner's response to Comment No. 88 is noted. The plans show approximately 30 ft of sidewalk will be constructed on the adjacent property to meet the current alignment. The petitioner is aware that there is the possibility of development on this site, which would require the dedication of the remaining 8 ft right-of-way along the east side of Chestnut Ave. In the event the necessary right-of-way is not dedicated to the Village prior to the installation of the sidewalk, an easement should be obtained from the adjacent property for this section of sidewalk. This can be addressed at final engineering.
120. The petitioner's response to Comment No. 89 is noted. Staff has discussed the intersection of Highland Ave and Campbell St, and has reviewed the traffic report prepared for this project along with pedestrian counts completed by the Village for other intersections in the immediate vicinity. Taking all factors into consideration, a three way stop should be installed at Highland Ave and Campbell St, and the bumpouts installed for the pedestrian access routes and ADA ramps. The necessary modifications to the plans, including modifications to on-street parking, can be addressed at final engineering.
121. The 6 inch sewer serving the Highland Ave building is mislabeled. This can be addressed at final engineering.
122. All building downspots shall be connected to the sewer. This can be addressed at final engineering.


Preliminary Plat of Subdivision:

123. The petitioner's response to Comment Nos. 91 thru 93 are acceptable.

Traffic:

124. The petitioner's responses to Comment Nos. 93, 95, 97, 99, 102, 103, 104, 106, and 108 are acceptable.
125. The response provided by the petitioner to Comment No. 94 is noted. Per Comment No. 120, bumpouts for the pedestrian access routes shall be installed at the intersection of Highland Ave and Campbell St, and at the SE corner of Campbell St and Chestnut Ave. The necessary modifications to the plans, including the radii, can be addressed at final engineering.
126. The petitioner's response to Comment No. 96 is noted.
- a. The installation of the bumpouts at the intersection of Highland Ave and Campbell St will result in modifications to the existing on-street parking on the north side of Campbell St. This can be addressed at final engineering.
 - b. The geometric plan only shows the existing parking stalls along Highland Ave. The relocated fire hydrant must be shown on the geometric plan, and the parking stalls in this section shall be revised to comply with the Illinois Rules of the Road setbacks. This may result in the elimination of one parking stall along the west side of Highland Ave. This can be addressed at final engineering.
 - c. Although the exhibit showing the site triangles provided in the traffic report recommends the elimination of several parking stalls to the east and west of the porte cochere, the loss of on-street parking in the downtown area is a concern. The site triangles and all required setbacks affecting on-street parking on Campbell St from Chestnut Ave to Highland Ave should be reevaluated such that as many on-street parking spaces as practically possible will be provided. The fire hydrant at the SE corner of Campbell St and Chestnut Ave shall be relocated to allow for two parking stalls west of the porte cochere. The plans shall be also be revised to account for three to four parking stalls east of the porte cochere. This can be addressed at final engineering.

127. The response provided by the petitioner to Comment No. 98 is noted. Per Comment No. 106, a provision will be made restricting / prohibiting loading operations along Chestnut Ave. As the Chestnut Ave is the only building without a designated loading bay, additional information should be provided to clarify how the loading operations associated with move in / move out for the Chestnut Ave building will be addressed. It is also recommended that the petitioner consider the possibility of accommodating box trucks in the underground parking for the Chestnut Ave building.
128. The response provided by the petitioner to Comment No. 100 is acceptable.
129. The response provided by the petitioner to Comment No. 101 is noted. The description under the Internal Circulation in the Traffic Report has not been updated, and needs to be building by building specific for proactive management for all of these functions.
130. The response provided by the petitioner to Comments Nos. 105 and 107 is acknowledged and requires further collaborative development with staff.

 3/21/19
Michael L. Pagones, P.E. Date
Village Engineer

RECEIVED
MAR 21 2019
PLANNING & COMMUNITY
DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT



Arlington Heights Fire Department Plan Review Sheet

P. C. Number 19-001

Project Name

Arlington 425

Project Location

Campbell, Highland, and Chestnut

Planning Department Contact Sam Hubbard

General Comments

Round 3:

1. The Fire Department would like a clear explanation and specs of what a "flat curb" will consist of and the locations where the "flat curb" will be.
2. Please show the area of the "Highland" and "Chestnut" buildings that will be reachable with out ladder truck basket when operating from a shortened fire lane between the two buildings. Please specify the length of the fire lane.
3. The use of brick pavers for fire lanes is not acceptable.

**NOTE: PLAN IS CONCEPTUAL ONLY
SUBJECT TO DETAILED PLAN REVIEW**

Date March 21, 2019

Reviewed By: LT. Mark Aleckson

Arlington Heights Fire Department

Planning & Community Development Dept. Review

March 22, 2019



REVIEW ROUND 3

Project: Northern 2/3rds Of Block 425
Arlington 425

Case Number: PC 19-001

General:

- 92. The response to comment #79 is noted. Please continue to evaluate alternative interior locations for the two loading docks proposed along Highland.
- 93. The response to comment #89 is noted. Please note that per Code requirements, this space must be factored into the parking calculations for the site. This was not factored in the parking study.
- 94. The response to comment #90 is noted. Please provide a detailed parking plan for the proposed Highland Avenue garage.
- 95. Provide revised traffic distribution data assuming that the driveway off Campbell is eliminated and the driveway off Highland is two way.
- 96. Please continue to evaluate the provision of affordable housing in advance of the Housing Commission meeting and continue discussions on this element with the Planning Department.

Prepared by: SAM JUBARI

Arlington 425
PC 19-001
March 21, 2019

Landscaping

- 1) Provide additional foundation plantings along Highland and Campbell.
The revisions are noted and per the response, movable planters will be provided.
- 2) Provide a detail of the proposed fence and retaining wall along the south property line.
Please include details as part of the plans.
- 3) Along the south elevation of 44 S. Highland incorporate ornamental trees and shrubs in order to soften the large span of wall. In addition, provide shade trees on the north elevation of 44 S. Highland.
The revisions are noted.
- 4) On the landscape plan, indicate the location of the below grade parking and the outline of the detention area.
The revisions are noted.
- 5) Provide additional screening adjacent to the transformer that is located south of 225 W. Campbell Street. In addition, provide a utility plan that identifies all mechanical units that are located at grade and indicate how they will be screened. All utilities must be fully screened with landscaping.
The revisions are noted.
- 6) In order to soften the mass of the proposed building at 33 S. Chestnut, incorporate ornamental trees along the west elevation.
The revisions are noted.
- 7) Provide a site furnishings package. It is recommended that large free standing planters be provided on the private property along Campbell and Highland.
The response is noted and please provide the details including the proposed movable planters.
- 8) Along Campbell and Highland incorporate bump outs at the corners and adjacent to each drive aisle.
The developer shall install bump-outs for the on-street parking spaces along the southern side of Campbell Street between Highland and Chestnut. This may include the relocation of an existing fire hydrant. (Additionally, the developer shall be responsible for installing bump outs for the proposed mid-block crosswalk at the eastern leg of the Campbell/Highland intersection.)
- 9) Along Campbell and Highland there is a large spans of brick pavers between the back of curb and the proposed building. It is recommended that the area be further evaluated and that raised planters similar to the planters along Harmony Park be incorporated. In addition, it is recommended that the space at the corner be evaluated. This is a focal point and the space should be further developed.
Please evaluate the corner area and incorporate relief through the use of planters. This is a focal point and the space should be further developed. It is recommended that raised planters similar to the planters along Harmony Park be incorporated along Campbell and Highland in front of 225 W. Campbell Street east of the Campbell drive aisle and north of the Highland drive aisle.

- 10) Provide landscaping adjacent to the screen wall for the loading area that is located south of 225 S. Campbell near Highland.
The revisions are noted.
- 11) The streetscape along Campbell and Highland must be consistent with the Downtown details/streetscape.
The response is noted; however, please incorporate the details within the plans.
- 12) As more detailed plans are provided additional comments may be forthcoming.
The response is noted.
- 13) Provide an interim landscape plan for each phase.
Install the trees and plant mix along the west elevation of 44 S. Highland between the fire lane and the building as part of the phase one landscaping.
- 14) Landscaping has been removed along the south property line in the southwest corner adjacent to the drive. Per Chapter 28, a six foot high screen is required since the site is zoned B-5 and is adjacent to the residential district. Please incorporate upright evergreen trees if space permits or request a variation. If evergreen trees are provided, the placement must consider site lines.
Instead of a solid fence, please incorporate a decorative open metal fence along the south property line. This will require a variation and staff is supportive of the variation.
- 15) Along the south property line adjacent to the parking garage provide a decorative metal fence. Previously a fence was shown on the plan.
Staff is recommending a decorative open metal fence along the south property line. This will require a variation and staff is supportive of the variation.
- 16) Along Campbell Street and Highland please include pavers within the drive aisle for the portion that is part of the pedestrian walkway. The pavers should match the downtown streetscape.
The response is noted.

ARLINGTON 425 – PC#: 19-001
PETITIONER RESPONSES TO ROUND 3 COMMENTS
APRIL 3, 2019

RESPONSES TO FIRE SAFETY DIVISION COMMENTS

1. Confirm that the length of the fire lane on the west side of 44 S. Highland is acceptable to the Fire Chief.

Response: Petitioner will confirm with the Fire Chief.

2. To confirm, brick pavers of any kind are not an approved surface for fire lanes.

Response: Duly noted. However, Petitioner understands that brick pavers are an approved surface for fire lanes provided that the proper evidence is submitted to show that the pavers are able support the weight of the heaviest fire truck and force impact of its outriggers. Petitioner will provide such evidence as part of final plat approval.

3. Provide the proposed width of the travel lane exiting onto West Campbell Street.

Response: The minimum drive aisle width in each direction is 14'-0" and dimensions will be added to the Architectural Site Plan.

ARLINGTON 425 – PC#: 19-001
PETITIONER RESPONSES TO ROUND 3 COMMENTS
APRIL 3, 2019

RESPONSES TO FIRE DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

1. The Fire Department would like a clear explanation and specs of what a "flat curb" will consist of and the locations where the "flat curb" will be.

Response: The "flat curb" was noted on a previous Architectural Site Plan at the entry into the courtyard fire lane and has been removed and is no longer noted.

2. Please show the area of the "Highland" and "Chestnut" buildings that will be reachable without ladder truck basket when operating from a shortened fire lane between the two buildings. Please specify the length of the fire lane.

Response: The 150' ladder basket aerial diagram is shown on Sheet AFD. In the event that the fire lane between the two buildings is shortened, Petitioner will show the reachable area without a ladder truck basket. The current fire lane distance between the two buildings is 245'.

3. The use of brick pavers for fire lanes is not acceptable.

Response: Duly noted. However, Petitioner understands that brick pavers are an approved surface for fire lanes provided that proper evidence is submitted to show that the pavers are able support the weight of the heaviest fire truck and force impact of its outriggers. Petitioner will provide such evidence as part of final plat approval.

ARLINGTON 425 – PC#: 19-001
PETITIONER RESPONSES TO ROUND 3 COMMENTS
APRIL 3, 2019

RESPONSES TO PLANNING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMENTS

General:

92. The response to comment #79 is noted. Please continue to evaluate alternative interior locations for the two loading docks proposed along Highland.

Response: Duly noted. Petitioner will continue to evaluate but does not plan to move the two loading docks along Highland at this time. However, the two loading docks area has been revised to allow for two additional street parking spaces per the revised plan.

93. The response to comment #89 is noted. Please note that per Code requirements, this space must be factored into the parking calculations for the site. This was not factored in the parking study.

Response: As noted, the basement space is storage only and does not factor in parking calculations for residential parking.

94. The response to comment #90 is noted. Please provide a detailed parking plan for the proposed Highland Avenue garage.

Response: A detailed parking plan for the Highland Avenue garage will be provided.

95. Provide revised traffic distribution data assuming that the driveway off Campbell is eliminated and the driveway off Highland is two way.

Response: Traffic was redistributed assuming no access on Campbell Street and the access on Highland allows two-way traffic flow. Please see Figure A of the revised traffic study, which shows the total projected traffic volumes assuming this development access configuration. Please also see Table 1 of the revised traffic study, which shows the projected levels of service for the respective intersections that assumes all-way stop sign control on Highland Avenue with Campbell Street and Sigwalt Street. As shown, these intersections are projected to operate at acceptable levels of service assuming this development access configuration.

96. Please continue to evaluate the provision of affordable housing in advance of the Housing Commission meeting and continue discussions on this element with the Planning Department.

Response: The provision of affordable housing will continue to be evaluated. This is currently being discussed, and it will be the subject of a hearing before the Housing Commission.

ARLINGTON 425 – PC#: 19-001
PETITIONER RESPONSES TO ROUND 3 COMMENTS
APRIL 3, 2019

RESPONSES TO LANDSCAPING COMMENTS

1. Provide additional foundation plantings along Highland and Campbell.
The revisions are noted and per the response, movable plants will be provided.

Response: No response required.

2. Provide a detail of the proposed fence and retaining wall along the south property line.
Please include details as part of the plans.

Response: Details of the fence and retaining wall along the south property line will be provided as a part of Petitioner's final plans and subject to the review and approval of staff.

3. Along the south elevation of 44 S. Highland incorporate ornamental trees and shrubs in order to soften the large span of wall. In addition, provide shade trees on the north elevation of 44 S. Highland.
The revisions are noted.

Response: No response required.

4. On the landscape plan, indicate the location of the below grade parking and the outline of the detention area.
The revisions are noted.

Response: No response required.

5. Provide additional screening adjacent to the transformer that is located south of 225 W. Campbell Street. In addition, provide a utility plan that identifies all mechanical units that are located at grade and indicate how they will be screened. All utilities must be fully screened with landscaping.
The revisions are noted.

Response: No response required.

6. In order to soften the mass of the proposed building at 33 S. Chestnut, incorporate ornamental trees along the west elevation.
The revisions are noted.

Response: No response required.

7. Provide a site furnishings package. It is recommended that large free standing planters be provided on the private property along Campbell and Highland.
The response is noted and please provide the details including the proposed movable planters.

Response: Details of the free standing planters will be provided as a part of Petitioner's final plans and subject to the review and approval of staff.

8. Along Campbell and Highland incorporate bump outs at the corners and adjacent to each drive aisle.
The developer shall install bump-outs for the on-street parking spaces along the southern side of Campbell Street between Highland and Chestnut. This may include the relocation of an existing fire hydrant. (Additionally, the developer shall be responsible for installing bump outs for the proposed mid-block crosswalk at the eastern leg of the Campbell/Highland intersection.)

Response: Duly noted. This will be addressed as part of final engineering.

9. Along Campbell and Highland there is a large spans of brick pavers between the back of curb and the proposed building. It is recommended that the area be further evaluated and that raised planters similar to the planters along Harmony Park be incorporated. In addition, it is recommended that the space at the corner be evaluated. This is a focal point and the space should be further developed.
Please evaluate the corner area and incorporate relief through the use of planters. This is a focal point and the space should be further developed. It is recommended that raised planters similar to the planters along Harmony Park be incorporated along Campbell and Highland in front of 225 W. Campbell Street east of the Campbell drive aisle and north of the Highland drive aisle.

Response: Duly noted. Petitioner will evaluate additional planters or working with the art commission to add a sculptural element.

10. Provide landscaping adjacent to the screen wall for the loading area that is located south of 225 S. Campbell near Highland.
The revisions are noted.

Response: No response required.

11. The streetscape along Campbell and Highland must be consistent with the Downtown details/streetscape.
The response is noted; however, please incorporate the details within the plans.

Response: The details will be incorporated within the plans.

12. As more detailed plans are provided additional comments may be forthcoming.
The response is noted.

Response: No response required.

13. Provide an interim landscape plan for each phase.
Install the trees and plant mix along the west elevation of 44 S. Highland between the fire lane and the building as part of the phase one landscaping.

Response: Duly noted. Trees and landscape along the west façade of the Highland building will be installed in Phase I.

14. Landscaping has been removed along the south property line in the southwest corner adjacent to the drive. Per Chapter 28, a six foot high screen is required since the site is zoned B-5 and is adjacent to the residential district. Please incorporate upright evergreen trees if space permits or request a variation. If evergreen trees are provided, the placement must consider site lines.
Instead of a solid fence, please incorporate a decorative open metal fence along the south property line. This will require a variation and staff is supportive of the variation.

Response: Plans will be updated to reflect a decorative open metal fence along the south property line.

15. Along the south property line adjacent to the parking garage provide a decorative metal fence. Previously a fence was shown on the plan.
Staff is recommending a decorative open metal fence along the south property line. This will require a variation and staff is supportive of the variation.

Response: Plans will be updated to reflect a decorative open metal fence along the south property line.

16. Along Campbell Street and Highland please include pavers within the drive aisle for the portion that is part of the pedestrian walkway. The pavers should match the downtown streetscape.
The response is noted.

Response: No response required.

ARLINGTON 425 – PC#: 19-001
PETITIONER RESPONSES TO ROUND 3 COMMENTS
APRIL 3, 2019

RESPONSES TO ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

109. The petitioner's response to Comment No. 75 is acceptable.

Response: No response required.

110. The petitioner's response to Comment No. 76 is noted. The widening of the fire lane has addressed the issues with the maneuvers through the site. Although pavement widths for one way entrances and exits are 14 ft maximum, this conflicts with the required fire lane width. The one way traffic flow through the site can be addressed with striping and any necessary signage. The "no parking fire lane" crosshatching is currently shown on the architectural site plan. The striping to designate the one way lane width and any necessary signage shall be shown on the civil site plans. This can be addressed at final engineering.

Response: Duly noted. The striping to designate the one way fire lane width and signage will be included on the final engineering plans.

111. The petitioner's response to Comment Nos. 77 thru 79 is acceptable.

Response: No response required.

112. The petitioner's response to Comment No. 80 is noted.

- a. Information was not provided to support the concrete layer coefficient of 0.50 for the structural number of the brick pavers. Provide additional information from the manufacturer and/or a Structural Engineer verifying that the layer coefficient for the heavy duty pavers is equivalent to the concrete layer coefficient. It should also be clarified that the structural number applies to both the permeable pavers and the brick pavers in the fire lane. This can be addressed at final engineering.

Response: Manufacturer information for the proposed concrete pavers (including permeable pavers) will be included in the final engineering submittal.

- b. The heavy duty pavement section must also be shown on the fire truck maneuver exhibits, on the geometric plan and the details. Revise the plans accordingly. This can be addressed at final engineering.

Response: The heavy duty pavement section will be included on the fire truck maneuver exhibits and the final engineering plans.

- c. Provide the cross section for the underground parking and fire lane. This can be addressed at final engineering.

Response: A cross section for the underground parking and fire lane will be addressed at final engineering.

- d. The reinforced lawn for the fire lane is not acceptable.

Response: Duly noted. However, Petitioner understands that brick pavers are an approved surface for fire lanes provided that the proper evidence is submitted to show that the pavers are able support the weight of the heaviest fire truck and force impact of its outriggers. Petitioner will provide such evidence as part of final plat approval.

- 113. The petitioner's response to Comment No. 81 is noted. Per Comment No. 112, a reinforced lawn for the fire lane is not acceptable.

Response: See Petitioner's response to 112.d. above.

- 114. The petitioner's response to Comment Nos. 82 and 83 are acceptable.

Response: No response required.

- 115. The petitioner's response to Comment No. 84 is noted. Per prior comments, it would be preferred to adjust the grades to eliminate the retaining wall. In no case shall the wall exceed 3 ft in height.

Response: Duly noted. The final retaining wall grading will be included in the final engineering plans. Retaining wall drawings and structural calculations by the retaining wall manufacturer will be submitted to the Village as part of the permit submittal.

- 116. The petitioner's response to Comment No. 85 is acceptable.

Response: Duly noted.

- 117. The petitioner's response to Comment No. 86 is noted.

- a. The petitioner's response does not address the underground parking for the Chestnut Ave building which will be located under the proposed fire lane between the Chestnut Ave building and Highland Ave building. Additional information shall be provided to address the respective phases of construction to verify that the fire lane will not be affected during Phase II. Please also see Comment No. 77 from the Planning Department.

Response: The fire lane will not be affected during Phase II. Any underground parking below the fire lane will be constructed in Phase I.

- b. Dimensions shall be placed on the staging plan to insure that there is adequate space for proposed traffic flow.

Response: The staging plan will be revised accordingly.

- 118. The petitioner's response to Comment No. 87 is acceptable.

Response: No response required.

- 119. The petitioner's response to Comment No. 88 is noted. The plans show approximately 30 ft of sidewalk will be constructed on the adjacent property to meet the current alignment. The petitioner is aware that there is the possibility of development on this site, which would require the dedication of the remaining 8 ft right-of-way along the east side of Chestnut Ave. In the event the necessary right-of-way is not dedicated to the Village prior to the installation of the sidewalk, an easement should be obtained from the adjacent property for this section of sidewalk. This can be addressed at final engineering.

Response: Duly noted. This will be addressed as part of final engineering.

- 120. The petitioner's response to Comment No. 89 is noted. Staff has discussed the intersection of Highland Ave and Campbell St, and has reviewed the traffic report prepared for this project along with pedestrian counts completed by the Village for other intersections in the immediate vicinity. Taking all factors into consideration, a three way stop should be installed at Highland Ave and Campbell St, and the bumpouts installed for the pedestrian access routes and ADA ramps. The necessary modifications to the plans, including modifications to on-street parking, can be addressed at final engineering.

Response: Duly noted. Petitioner plans for an all-way stop sign at Highland Avenue and Campbell Street. Plans will be revised as necessary.

- 121. The 6 inch sewer serving the Highland Ave building is mislabeled. This can be addressed at final engineering.

Response: Duly noted. The Highland Ave. sanitary service size will be addressed as part of final engineering.

- 122. All building downspouts shall be connected to the sewer. This can be addressed at final engineering.

Response: Duly noted. All building roof drains and downspouts will connect to the site storm sewer system and will discharge to the stormwater detention vault. This information will be included in the final engineering plans.

Preliminary Plat of Subdivision:

- 123. The petitioner's response to Comment Nos. 91 through 93 are acceptable.

Response: No response required.

Traffic:

124. The petitioner's responses to Comment Nos. 93, 95, 97, 99, 102, 103, 104, 106, and 108 are acceptable.

Response: No response required.

125. The response provided by the petitioner to Comment No. 94 is noted. Per Comment No. 120, bumpouts for the pedestrian access routes shall be installed at the intersection of Highland Ave and Campbell St, and at the SE corner of Campbell St and Chestnut Ave. The necessary modifications to the plans, including the radii, can be addressed at final engineering.

Response: Duly noted. This will be addressed as part of final engineering.

126. The petitioner's response to Comment No. 96 is noted.
- a. The installation of the bumpouts at the intersection of Highland Ave and Campbell St will result in modifications to the existing on-street parking on the north side of Campbell St. This can be addressed at final engineering.

Response: Duly noted. This will be addressed as part of final engineering.

- b. The geometric plan only shows the existing parking stalls along Highland Ave. The relocated fire hydrant must be shown on the geometric plan, and the parking stalls in this section shall be revised to comply with the Illinois Rules of the Road setbacks. This may result in the elimination of one parking stall along the west side of Highland Ave. This can be addressed at final engineering.

Response: Duly noted. This will be addressed as part of final engineering.

- c. Although the exhibit showing the site triangles provided in the traffic report recommends the elimination of several parking stalls to the east and west of the porte cochere, the loss of on-street parking in the downtown area is a concern. The site triangles and all required setbacks affecting on-street parking on Campbell St from Chestnut Ave to Highland Ave should be reevaluated such that as many on-street parking spaces as practically possible will be provided. The fire hydrant at the SE corner of Campbell St and Chestnut Ave shall be relocated to allow for two parking stalls west of the porte cochere. The plans shall be also be revised to account for three to four parking stalls east of the porte cochere. This can be addressed at final engineering.

Response: Duly noted. This will be addressed as part of final engineering.

127. The response provided by the petitioner to Comment No. 98 is noted. Per Comment No. 106, a provision will be made restricting / prohibiting loading operations along Chestnut Ave. As the Chestnut Ave is the only building without a designated loading bay, additional information should be provided to clarify how the loading operations associated with move in / move out for the Chestnut Ave building will be addressed. It is also recommended that the petitioner consider the possibility of accommodating box trucks in the underground parking for the Chestnut Ave building.

Response: Duly noted. This will be addressed as part of final engineering.

128. The response provided by the petitioner to Comment No. 100 is acceptable.

Response: No response required.

129. The response provided by the petitioner to Comment No. 101 is noted. The description under the Internal Circulation in the Traffic Report has not been updated, and needs to be building by building specific for proactive management for all of these functions.

Response: Duly noted. This will be addressed as part of final engineering.

130. The response provided by the petitioner to Comments Nos. 105 and 107 is acknowledged and requires further collaborative development with staff.

Response: Duly noted. This will be addressed as part of final engineering.

April 3, 2019

Mr. Bruce Adreani
CCH LLC
838 Busse Highway
Park Ridge, Illinois 60068

Re: Arlington 425

Dear Bruce:

We are in receipt of the Village of Arlington Heights Round 3 review comments and offer the following responses to the traffic-related comments.

Planning & Community Development Dept Review (3/22/2019)

93. As noted, the basement space is storage only and does not factor into the parking calculations for residential parking.
95. Traffic was redistributed assuming no access on Campbell Street and the access on Highland allows two-way traffic flow. Attached is Figure A, which shows the total projected traffic volumes assuming this development access configuration. Also attached is Table 1, which shows the projected levels of service for the respective intersections that assumes all-way stop sign control on Highland Avenue with Campbell Street and Sigwalt Street. As shown, these intersections are projected to operate at acceptable levels of service assuming this development access configuration.

Parking

The shared parking analysis was updated to reflect the revised proposed parking capacity of 507 parking spaces for the Campbell/Highland buildings for the following four scenarios:

1. Weekday – 1.5 spaces residential – ITE/ULI all other uses (Table A)
2. Weekend – 1.5 spaces residential – ITE/ULI all other uses (Table B)
3. Weekday – 1.3 spaces residential – ITE/ULI all other uses (Table C)
4. Weekend – 1.3 spaces residential – ITE/ULI all other uses (Table D)

All scenarios were performed using the ITE hourly distribution for the residential land use since the hourly distribution provides more current data than what is provided in ULI.

Under Scenarios 1 and 2, the shared parking analysis shows that there will be a parking surplus of 42 parking spaces on a weekday (Table A) and a parking deficit of 39 parking spaces on the weekend (Table B). This deficit is lower than previously presented due to the increased parking supply of 507 parking space from 460 parking spaces previously proposed.

Mr. Bruce Adreani
April 3, 2019
Page 2

Under Scenarios 3 and 4, the shared parking analysis shows that there will be a parking surplus of 99 spaces on a weekday (Table C) and a parking surplus of 21 parking spaces on the weekend (Table D). As such, there will be a parking surplus throughout the week under the 1.3 residential parking rate.

As such, the proposed 507 parking spaces will be more than adequate to accommodate peak parking demands based on the following.

- The shared parking analysis using the residential 1.3 spaces per unit ratio shows that there will be a parking surplus during peak parking demand hours for both the weekday and weekend.
- The shared parking analysis assumes all parked vehicles will be new trips and does not discount patrons of the non-residential uses that may already live in the building or live nearby and walk/bike to the development without needing to park in the garage.
- Employees of the non-residential uses may commute to the development via public transportation or may live in the area and walk/bike to the site.
- Census data shows that approximately five percent of the residents in the area do not own a car and therefore will not need a parking space to patron the non-residential uses.
- Further, based on this Census data, residents may not own a vehicle, thereby reducing the peak residential parking demand throughout the day.


Should you have any questions or require additional information, please let me know.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Luay R. Aboona', is written over a horizontal line.

Luay R. Aboona, PE, PTOE
Principal

Enclosures



ARLINGTON 425 DEVELOPMENT
 ARLINGTON HEIGHTS, ILLINOIS

TOTAL PROJECTED TRAFFIC VOLUMES
 (NO ACCESS ON CAMPBELL STREET)



Job No: 18-127

Figure: A

Table 1
CAPACITY ANALYSIS RESULTS – FUTURE TRAFFIC CONDITIONS
(NO ACCESS ON CAMPBELL STREET)

Intersection/Approach	Weekday Morning Peak Hour		Weekday Evening Peak Hour	
	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay
Highland Avenue and Campbell Street				
• Overall	A	8.4	A	9.5
• Eastbound Approach	A	8.6	A	9.3
• Westbound Approach	A	8.4	B	10.1
• Northbound Approach	A	7.8	A	8.9
Chestnut Avenue and Campbell Street				
• Northbound Approach	B	13.7	C	17.2
• Southbound Approach	B	12.4	B	14.8
Highland Avenue and Sigwalt Street				
• Overall	B	11.1	B	11.0
• Eastbound Approach	B	12.0	B	10.0
• Westbound Approach	B	10.9	B	11.8
• Northbound Approach	A	9.4	A	9.2
• Southbound Approach	B	10.5	B	11.0
Chestnut Avenue and Sigwalt Street				
• Northbound Approach	B	12.2	B	13.0
• Southbound Approach	B	14.0	B	14.7
Highland Avenue and North Garage Ramp				
• Westbound Approach	B	10.4	B	12.1
Chestnut Avenue and Exit Access				
• Westbound Approach	A	9.3	A	9.7
Chestnut Avenue and 33 West Chestnut Access				
• Westbound Approach	A	9.7	B	10.2
Highland Avenue and Proposed Access				
• Eastbound Approach	A	9.7	B	11.7
Highland Avenue and South Garage Ramp/Access				
• Eastbound Approach	B	10.6	B	12.0
• Westbound Approach	B	10.9	C	15.8
LOS = Level of Service Delay is measured in seconds.				

Table A
Shared Parking Analysis - Arlington 425
Weekday - Village Code (1.5 Residential) and ITE (All Other Uses)

<u>Land Use/Density</u>	<u>Average Peak Parking Demand</u>
<u>Retail</u>	
16,028 s.f.	33
<u>Restaurants</u>	
12,075 s.f.	85
<u>Office</u>	
7,500 s.f.	16
<u>44 South Highland Residential</u>	
125 Units	188
<u>225 Campbell Residential</u>	
182 Units	273

Total Peak Parking Demand based on Individual Land Use: 595
Total Peak Parking Space Demand based on Shared Parking: 465
Parking Spaces Proposed: 507
Parking Surplus/(Deficit): 42

Time	Retail	Restaurant	Office	Residential	Total
6:00 AM	0	22	0	424	446
7:00 AM	2	37	9	341	389
8:00 AM	6	48	13	295	362
9:00 AM	13	65	15	295	388
10:00 AM	22	72	16	295	405
11:00 AM	30	78	16	295	419
12:00 PM	33	85	14	295	427
1:00 PM	32	77	12	295	416
2:00 PM	31	45	13	295	384
3:00 PM	29	36	13	295	373
4:00 PM	26	36	12	203	277
5:00 PM	20	65	7	272	364
6:00 PM	21	71	4	318	414
7:00 PM	25	54	0	304	383
8:00 PM	23	56	0	346	425
9:00 PM	0	54	0	355	409
10:00 PM	0	41	0	424	465

Table B
Shared Parking Analysis - Arlington 425
Weekend - Village Code (1.5 Residential) and ITE/ULI (All Other Uses)

<u>Land Use/Density</u>	<u>Average Peak Parking Demand</u>
<u>Retail</u>	
16,028 s.f.	37
<u>Restaurants</u>	
12,075 s.f.	108
<u>Office</u>	
7,500 s.f.	16
<u>44 South Highland Residential</u>	
125 Units	188
<u>225 Campbell Residential</u>	
182 Units	273

Total Peak Parking Demand based on Individual Land Use: 622
Total Peak Parking Space Demand based on Shared Parking: 546
Parking Spaces Proposed: 507
Parking Surplus/(Deficit): (39)

Time	Retail	Restaurant	Office	Residential	Total
6:00 AM	0	22	0	461	483
7:00 AM	5	32	3	415	455
8:00 AM	10	55	10	392	467
9:00 AM	22	79	13	369	483
10:00 AM	28	102	14	346	490
11:00 AM	33	108	16	323	480
12:00 PM	37	100	14	300	451
1:00 PM	37	91	13	323	464
2:00 PM	36	68	10	323	437
3:00 PM	34	42	6	323	405
4:00 PM	28	52	3	346	429
5:00 PM	25	59	2	392	478
6:00 PM	27	68	1	415	511
7:00 PM	19	80	0	447	546
8:00 PM	19	59	0	452	530
9:00 PM	0	42	0	456	498
10:00 PM	0	43	0	461	504

Table C
Shared Parking Analysis - Arlington 425
Weekday - Village Code (1.3 Residential) and ITE (All Other Uses)

<u>Land Use/Density</u>	<u>Average Peak Parking Demand</u>
<u>Retail</u>	
16,028 s.f.	33
<u>Restaurants</u>	
12,075 s.f.	85
<u>Office</u>	
7,500 s.f.	16
<u>44 South Highland Residential</u>	
125 Units	162
<u>225 Campbell Residential</u>	
182 Units	237

Total Peak Parking Demand based on Individual Land Use: 533
Total Peak Parking Space Demand based on Shared Parking: 408
Parking Spaces Proposed: 507
Parking Surplus/(Deficit): 99

Time	Retail	Restaurant	Office	Residential	Total
6:00 AM	0	22	0	367	389
7:00 AM	2	37	9	295	343
8:00 AM	6	48	13	255	322
9:00 AM	13	65	15	255	348
10:00 AM	22	72	16	255	365
11:00 AM	30	78	16	255	379
12:00 PM	33	85	14	255	387
1:00 PM	32	77	12	255	376
2:00 PM	31	45	13	255	344
3:00 PM	29	36	13	255	333
4:00 PM	26	36	12	176	250
5:00 PM	20	65	7	235	327
6:00 PM	21	71	4	275	371
7:00 PM	25	54	0	263	342
8:00 PM	23	56	0	299	378
9:00 PM	0	54	0	307	361
10:00 PM	0	41	0	367	408

Table D
Shared Parking Analysis - Arlington 425
Weekend - Village Code (1.3 Residential) and ITE/ULI (All Other Uses)

<u>Land Use/Density</u>	<u>Average Peak Parking Demand</u>
<u>Retail</u>	
16,028 s.f.	37
<u>Restaurants</u>	
12,075 s.f.	108
<u>Office</u>	
7,500 s.f.	16
<u>44 South Highland Residential</u>	
125 Units	162
<u>225 Campbell Residential</u>	
182 Units	237

Total Peak Parking Demand based on Individual Land Use: 560
Total Peak Parking Space Demand based on Shared Parking: 486
Parking Spaces Proposed: 507
Parking Surplus/(Deficit): 21

Time	Retail	Restaurant	Office	Residential	Total
6:00 AM	0	22	0	399	421
7:00 AM	5	32	3	359	399
8:00 AM	10	55	10	339	414
9:00 AM	22	79	13	319	433
10:00 AM	28	102	14	299	443
11:00 AM	33	108	16	279	436
12:00 PM	37	100	14	259	410
1:00 PM	37	91	13	279	420
2:00 PM	36	68	10	279	393
3:00 PM	34	42	6	279	361
4:00 PM	28	52	3	299	382
5:00 PM	25	59	2	339	425
6:00 PM	27	68	1	359	455
7:00 PM	19	80	0	387	486
8:00 PM	19	59	0	391	469
9:00 PM	0	42	0	395	437
10:00 PM	0	43	0	399	442



Village of Arlington Heights Building & Life Safety Department

Interoffice Memorandum

To: Sam Hubbard, Development Planner, Planning and Community Development
From: Deb Pierce, Plan Reviewer, Building & Life Safety Department
Subject: Arlington 425 – PUD, Preliminary Plat of Subdivision, Rezoning from R-1 to B-5, LUV for Apartment Building, Variations
PC#: 19-001 – Round 2
Date: March 3, 2019

General Comments:

The information provided is conceptual only and subject to a formal plan review.

Sam...

I do not have any more comments.

RECEIVED

MAR 04 2019

PLANNING & COMMUNITY
DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT



**Village of Arlington Heights, IL
Department of Building & Life Safety**

Fire Safety Division

Date: 3/6/2019

P.C. Number: 19-001 Round 2

Project Name: Planned Unit Development – Arlington 425

Project Location: Block 425

Planning Department Contact: Sam Hubbard, Planning and Community Development

General Comments:

The information provided is conceptual only and subject to a formal plan review.

1. The fire lane for the south Highland building (high rise) shall be a hard surface approved by the Fire Chief capable of supporting the loads of fire apparatus to include point loads generated from outriggers of the aerial truck. Soft turf of any kind is not an approved surface.
2. All fire lanes shall be of appropriate width without encroaching into adjacent use areas and shall be maintained free from the parking/standing of any vehicle at any time. Appropriate fire lane signage shall be placed along the routes of all fire lanes.
3. Elevated curbs crossing fire lanes shall not be approved. Entrances to fire lanes from other areas or fire lanes shall be of minimal elevation to prevent compromise of apparatus mounting elevated surfaces.
4. Provide a detailed explanation showing how the east side of the building along Highland will be accessible in order to meet the requirement that all first floor areas be accessible within 150 feet of fire apparatus/hose lines.
5. Provide acknowledgment that the fire lane provided for the Highland building along the west side shall not be removed for any reason once it is established. It is believed there was discussion about removing this area prior to the second phase of the project and that this would not be permitted, however, no comments were provided acknowledging the understanding that this would not be allowed.
6. It is requested that language be added to the ordinance that would prevent the erection of any structure or placement of any obstruction into the fire lane along the west side of the Highland building.

RECEIVED

Date 03-06-19

MAR 06 2019 Reviewed By:

**PLANNING & COMMUNITY
DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT**

[Signature]
Fire Safety Supervisor

PLAN COMMISSION PC #19-001

Arlington 425

PUD, Preliminary Plat of Subdivision, Rezoning from R-1 to B-1

LUV for Apartment Building, Variations

Round 2

RECEIVED

MAR 11 2019

**PLANNING & COMMUNITY
DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT**

75. The petitioner's response to Comment Nos. 11 thru 17 are acceptable.
76. The petitioner's response to Comment No. 18 is not acceptable. Although an exhibit has been added to show fire access to the courtyard between the Chestnut Ave and Highland Ave buildings, there are still issues with the maneuvers shown at several other locations. The drop off lanes shall not be considered part of the necessary 26 ft wide fire lane. Revise the plans accordingly.
77. The petitioner's response to Comment No. 19 is noted. The existing conditions of the portion of Highland Ave under the parking garage have been added to the preliminary engineering plans, however; they are not shown on the plat. Revise the plat accordingly.
78. The petitioner's response to Comment No. 20 is acceptable.
79. The petitioner's response to Comment No. 21 is not acceptable. Per Comment No. 76, the drop off lanes shall not be considered part of the necessary 26 ft wide fire lane. The maneuvers provided for all trucks appear to still be problematic and several of the maneuvers conflict with the drop off lane and mountable center median. The fire lanes shall be revised to 26 ft minimum and all exhibits revised accordingly.
80. The petitioner's response to Comment No. 22 is noted. The structural number provided references a concrete layer coefficient of 0.50. Provide additional information from the manufacturer and/or a Structural Engineer verifying that the layer coefficient for the heavy duty pavers is equivalent to the concrete layer coefficient. It should also be clarified that the structural number applies to both the permeable pavers and the brick pavers in the fire lane. The heavy duty pavement section must also be shown on the fire truck maneuver exhibits, on the geometric plan and the details. Revise the plans accordingly. The reinforced lawn is not acceptable. The plans shall be revised to provide a hard surface that meets or exceeds the structural number of the Village's heavy duty pavement section. Provide the cross section for the underground parking and fire lane.
81. The petitioner's response to Comment No. 23 is not acceptable. See Comment No. 80.
82. The petitioner's response to Comment No. 24 is noted. The adjoining property has not submitted preliminary plans for staff to review and comment. The Village would have a similar request of the adjoining property to coordinate cross-access with Arlington 425. When revising the site plan, the possibility of cross-access should still be taken into consideration.
83. The petitioner's response to Comment Nos. 25 thru 29 are acceptable.
84. The petitioner's response to Comment No. 30 is noted. The retaining wall shall not be located on the property line, assess the possibility of accounting for the change in elevation at the garage. If a retaining wall is still necessary, the maximum height shall be 3 ft. Provide a detail of the retaining wall and footing. Revise the grading and proposed elevations accordingly.
85. The petitioner's response to Comment Nos. 31 thru 32 is acceptable.
86. The petitioner's response to Comment No. 33 is not acceptable. The fire access between the Chestnut Ave and Highland Ave buildings must be fully constructed in Phase I and not disturbed by Phase II. Provide preliminary Phase I and Phase II plans.

87. The petitioner's response to Comment No. 34 is noted. Provide the service plans from the respective utilities as they become available,
88. The sidewalk along Chestnut Ave, at the south end, should continue at 1 ft from the new right-of-way and not angle back to the current alignment, including through the 35 S Chestnut driveway. Revise the plans accordingly and adjust the grades as necessary for the new location of the sidewalk through the driveway. Future development of the adjoining property will address the remaining section of sidewalk.
89. The Village is considering constructing a north/south pedestrian crossing of Campbell St at the SE corner of Highland Ave and Campbell St, possibly by installing a "bump out". The petitioner is made aware that this may affect the alignment of the sidewalk ramp at the SW corner of Highland Ave and Campbell St. Any necessary modifications to the plans can be addressed at final engineering.

Preliminary Plat of Subdivision:

90. The petitioner's response to Comment No. 35 is noted. Provide the length for the 8' wide dedication south of the garage.
91. The petitioner's response to Comment Nos. 36 and 37 are acceptable.
92. In reference to Comment No. 77, revise the preliminary plat to show the existing conditions of the Highland Ave R.O.W. area under the Vail Street Garage.

Traffic:


93. The petitioner's responses to comments 38, 40, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 52, 54, 55, 56, 58, 59, 60, 64, 65, 66, 68, 71, 72 are satisfactory.
94. The response provided by the petitioner to comment #39 is noted. The existing radii at the S.E. corner of Campbell St and Chestnut Ave and the S.W. corner of Campbell St and Highland Ave is less than 25 ft. The corners can remain provided no changes are planned, however; in the event that corner bumpouts are installed for ADA ramps, the corners must have a minimum back of curb radius of 25 ft.
95. The petitioner's response to comment #41 is noted. The exhibit showing the site triangles supports a recommendation to establish all-way stop at the intersection of Campbell St and Highland Ave. Refer also to comments #89 and #94.
96. The response provided by the petitioner to comment #42 is not satisfactory. The geometric layout of on-street parking stalls does not comply with these Illinois Rules of the Road setbacks. Revise geometric plan accordingly.
97. The response provided by the petitioner to comment #51 is not satisfactory. The last statement made suggests that the south Highland parking garage driveway volumes are higher than the driveway out of the N.W. corner of the Highland building. However Figure 7 does not support this contention.

98. The response provided by the petitioner to comment #53 is not satisfactory. The comment made disregards the 4 sentences requesting explanation of truck operations, anticipated volumes of truck deliveries, moving operations, and service and refuse activities that will occur. Additionally, discussion about anticipated truck delivery operation times should be provided that distribute and stage vehicles, and insure compliance with code noise and nuisance controls. The plans and exhibits shall be revised to show the new location of the loading docks.
99. The response provided by the petitioner to comment #57 is noted. Provide a preliminary construction staging plan at final engineering, a final construction staging plan will be required for permit.
100. The response provided by the petitioner to comment #61 is satisfactory.
101. The response provided by the petitioner to comment #62 is not satisfactory. Please identify where in the traffic report the utilization, designation, and operation of the on-site parking/drop off lanes is managed or regulated. Condo declarations or site management documents that clearly indicate movement of goods by utilization of the truck loading bays, or these on-site surface zones, to keep this activity off of the public streets..
102. The response provided by the petitioner to comment #63 is not satisfactory. There is no sight triangle diagram for the south Highland Building driveway contained in the report.
103. The response provided by the petitioner to comment #67 is not satisfactory. Again the relocation of more traffic to the north Highland Building garage, rather than the south driveway results in more traffic moving towards the north. There still are a couple of arithmetic errors for the Campbell street driveway, and not summing correctly at the Chestnut @ Campbell intersection, as well as the Highland driveway into the site.
104. The response provided by the petitioner to comment #69 is not satisfactory. It is understood that the values have been corrected, and that original entries into the Synchro analysis did utilize the proper traffic volumes. However in the description of the intersection Levels of Service, the impact of bicyclist and pedestrian confluence is not represented or factored into the delay calculations.
105. The response provided by the petitioner to comment #70 is not satisfactory. Based upon the values evaluated, were any intersection modifications, channelization changes, pedestrian crosswalk, or sidewalk revisions indicated? It shall also be noted that the updated weekend and evening counts were conducted in February. Pedestrian and vehicular traffic is likely greater on weekends and evenings in warmer weather.
106. The response provided by the petitioner to comment #73 is noted. The Planning Department is supportive of a condition to restrict move-in, move-out loading operations in the drop off zone. The Engineering Division concurs with this assessment. A provision should be contained in the Approved Village Ordinance prohibiting loading operations along Chestnut Avenue.

107. The response provided by the petitioner to comment #74 is not satisfactory. There are several factors not addressed, and a confusing representation of the parking analysis that need to be redefined as identified below:

- a.) The traffic report suggests that for Transit Oriented Developments, (TOD) a 15% reduction is feasible, but it is unclear if this is an ITE study, or based upon the values in Table 6. If based upon Table 6 summary, there are too many variables that cannot be evaluated for these locations that may have factors to compensate parking in these towns by other methods. Please clarify if any parking reduction is applied as part of the study recommendations.
- b.) The shared parking analyzes shown in Tables 7, 8, & 9, are confusing related to the following:
 - How were Retail, Restaurant, and Office values calculated in Table 7
 - Showing the total site parking requirement but including the 33 S. Chestnut building which is not part of the shared parking analysis is confusing.
 - Provide the ITE parking rates that justify the values shown in Table 8.
 - Why are the residential values between table 7 & 9 the same, and what is the difference that is trying to be shown?

108. Bullets #5 & #6 in the conclusions contradict the findings, and responses provided in the previous comments listed above.

 3/8/19
Michael L. Pagones, P.E. Date
Village Engineer



Arlington Heights Fire Department Plan Review Sheet

P. C. Number 19-001

Project Name

Arlington 425

Project Location

Campbell, Highland, and Chestnut

Planning Department Contact Sam Hubbard

General Comments

Round 2:

1. The fire lane between the Highland and Chestnut building needs to be free of obstructions and run the entire length of the building. The use of reinforced lawn pavers is not acceptable.
2. The auto turn diagram for the fire truck shows the use of the circle. Please provide more information as to how the circle is going to be built. The use of a "mountable fire lane" as is not acceptable.
3. The auto turn diagram shows the truck using some areas that don't appear to be driving surfaces. For example, the inbound truck maneuver from Highland. The front overhang of the basket needs to also have a clear path.

**NOTE: PLAN IS CONCEPTUAL ONLY
SUBJECT TO DETAILED PLAN REVIEW**

Date March 4, 2019

Reviewed By: LT. Mark Aleckson

Arlington Heights Fire Department

ARLINGTON HEIGHTS POLICE DEPARTMENT

Community Services Bureau

DEPARTMENT PLAN REVIEW SUMMARY

Arlington 425
45 S. Chestnut Ave.

Round 1 Review Comments

02/01/2019

1. **Character of use:**
Nothing further.
2. **Are lighting requirements adequate?**
Nothing further.
3. **Present traffic problems?**
Nothing further.
4. **Traffic accidents at particular location?**
Nothing further.
5. **Traffic problems that may be created by the development.**
Nothing further.
6. **General comments:**
Nothing further.

RECEIVED
MAR 07 2019
PLANNING & COMMUNITY
DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

 #330

Alexandra Ovington, Crime Prevention Officer
Community Services Bureau

 #557

Doug Hajek, Sergeant
Community Services Bureau



Planning & Community Development Dept. Review

March 8, 2019

REVIEW ROUND 2


Project: Northern 2/3rds Of Block 425
Arlington 425

Case Number: PC 19-001

General:

74. The response to comment #7 is noted. Based on a review of the revised plans, the following additional or amended approvals are needed:
- a. Variation to Chapter 28, Section 5.1-14.2, Required Minimum Yards, to allow a 12.2' setback along a public street frontage (Chestnut Street) for the Chestnut building where code requires a 20' setback.
 - b. Variation to Chapter 28, Section 5.1-14.2, Required Minimum Yards, to allow a 0' setback along an interior lot line (southern lot line) for the Highland building where code requires a 25' setback.
 - c. Variation to Chapter 28, Section 10.2-7, Size, to allow certain parking spaces within the Highland building garage to be 15.3' in depth where code requires 18' in depth.
 - d. Variation to Chapter 28, Section 6.15-2.2, Landscape Requirements between Zoning Districts, to waive the requirement for a 6-foot tall solid screen along the southern property line.
75. The response to comment #9 is noted. A condition of approval will be recommended that shall require the recording of bylaws or covenants that established shared access and shared parking for the development should portions of the subject property be sold to separate owners.
76. The response to comment #11 is noted. Please note that the project narrative refers to a "Special Use Permit" and "Written Justification for Special Use" for the "all residential" Chestnut building. The specific approval needed for the Chestnut building is a Land Use Variation (not a Special Use), and the project narrative and approval justification should be revised accordingly. Please note that approval criteria for a Land Use Variation is different than that for a Special Use Permit. Finally, please revise the previously submitted justification for variations to reflect the actual variations requested per #74 above, and please provide justifications for the newly identified variation.
77. The response to comment #15 is not acceptable. We have not received the Power Construction site staging and logistics plan. Please provide this plan and note that the plan must identify preliminary estimates of any lane closures and closure timeframes. Since the description of what will be constructed in Phase 1 is vague, our comment asked for clarification on what will be constructed in each phase. Please outline, *specifically*, all infrastructure (both onsite and off-site), and common areas that will be constructed in Phase 1 and in Phase 2. Finally, please address how fire protection will be provided to the Highland Building if the underground garage for the Chestnut building causes the temporary removal of this fire lane.
78. The response to comment #21 is not sufficient. Please revise the plans to show a 26' wide one-way fire lane, which will require the existing proposed 17' wide lane to extend to the north. A condition of approval will be recommended that will require the developer to implement two-way travel along this drive aisle if, after construction, it is determined that two-way travel is necessary for adequate circulation and traffic flow. Please verify if the underground connection in this location has the structural ability to support the two-way drive aisle.

79. The response to comment #25 is not sufficient. The two loading spaces and garage access along Highland Avenue will result in the loss of at least nine public parking spaces and will result in congestion and truck turning movements adjacent to one of the entrances to the Vail Avenue garage. Please remove the two loading spaces and relocate them elsewhere on the interior of the site. Other options include:
- a) Placing them in the area where bike parking is located within the Highland building garage.
 - b) To the west of the bike racks within the Highland building garage where the parcel pickup space is located.
 - c) Locating them in a portion of the 2,869 sq. ft. space that is currently designated as retail within the Highland building.
80. The response to comment #26 is noted. The Planning Dept. and Engineering Division are evaluating if certain spaces along Campbell may remain.
81. The response to comment #27 is noted. A 6' tall solid screen (landscaping, fence, or berm) is required along the southern property line to comply with the screening requirements between zoning districts, or a variation is required. Please provide the required justification for this approval. The 42" tall fence in the exterior side yard in front of the Chestnut building must be an "open" style fence.
82. The response to comment #31 and #32 is noted. Since no details have been provided, a condition of approval will be recommended that will require all utility service lines to be underground, all ground mounted utility and mechanical equipment (switchgears, generators, transformers, etc.) to be appropriately located and screened, and all building mounted utility infrastructure (meters, utility/FDC connections, etc.) to be appropriately located and screened.
83. The response to comment #32 is noted. Since no preliminary analysis has been provided, a condition of approval will be recommended that prohibits all construction activities from damaging the Vail Avenue garage. A full structural analysis and soil borings will be required at time of building permit. The Village reserves the right to review any proposed modifications to the Vail Avenue garage and the ability to require certain upgrades to the garage as necessary to facilitate the proposed development (e.g. additional interior lighting, re-routing of electrical lines, etc.). Costs of any garage modifications, insurance, and bonds shall be the developers responsibility.
84. The response to comment #35 is noted. Staff is evaluating restrictions that would be placed on move-in/move-out days, times and locations.
85. The response to comment #42 is noted. The 140'-0" measurement is not accurate based on the code definition of building height. The code definition does not include the parapet wall. Provide an elevation and height measurement from elevation 697.00 at the north façade adjacent to the front entrance, which is what we've interpreted the established grade to be opposite the middle of the front of the building. See graphic below for further clarification:



86. The response to comment #45 is not sufficient. Please provide on the plans details for the screen walls (height, material, compatibility to building architecture, style and appearance of gates, etc.).
87. The response to comment #47 is noted. A condition of approval will be recommended that would prohibit the Campbell and Highland building from being converted to condo unless an amendment to the PUD is approved.
88. The response to comment #53 is noted. Based on the new area of ROW dedication, the building setback at the southeast of the property needs to jog in to accommodate for this ROW area. Please revise the plat to make this change.
89. The response to comment #55 is noted. The parking table on pages 39-41 do not include the newly shown auxiliary basement retail space within the Campbell Building. Please revise the parking study to accommodate for this new retail space. The "Arlington 425 Unit Mix Parking" document should be revised to be consistent with the square footages as shown within the parking study.
90. The response to comment #66 and 67 does not provide enough specificity to address the comments. Before we can make a recommendation on this project, a detailed parking plan outlining how parking will function is required. Please provide said plan. The plan must explain how parking for the commercial, restaurant, and office uses will be accommodated, as well as the residential portion of the development. The Highland building will

- Prepared by: SANJEEV

Arlington 425
PC 19-001
March 6, 2019

Landscaping

- 1) Provide additional foundation plantings along Highland and Campbell.
The revisions are noted and per the response, movable planters will be provided.
- 2) Provide a detail of the proposed fence and retaining wall along the south property line.
Please include details as part of the plans.
- 3) Along the south elevation of 44 S. Highland incorporate ornamental trees and shrubs in order to soften the large span of wall. In addition, provide shade trees on the north elevation of 44 S. Highland.
The revisions are noted.
- 4) On the landscape plan, indicate the location of the below grade parking and the outline of the detention area.
The revisions are noted.
- 5) Provide additional screening adjacent to the transformer that is located south of 225 W. Campbell Street. In addition, provide a utility plan that identifies all mechanical units that are located at grade and indicate how they will be screened. All utilities must be fully screened with landscaping.
The revisions are noted.
- 6) In order to soften the mass of the proposed building at 33 S. Chestnut, incorporate ornamental trees along the west elevation.
The revisions are noted.
- 7) Provide a site furnishings package. It is recommended that large free standing planters be provided on the private property along Campbell and Highland.
Please include details as part of the plans.
- 8) Along Campbell and Highland incorporate bump outs at the corners and adjacent to each drive aisle.
As part of the plans, incorporate the bump-outs along Campbell Street and Highland.
- 9) Along Campbell and Highland there is a large spans of brick pavers between the back of curb and the proposed building. It is recommended that the area be further evaluated and that raised planters similar to the planters along Harmony Park be incorporated. In addition, it is recommended that the space at the corner be evaluated. This is a focal point and the space should be further developed.
Please evaluate the corner area and incorporate relief through the use of planters. This is a focal point and the space should be further developed. It is recommended that raised planters similar to the planters along Harmony Park be incorporated along Campbell and Highland in front of 225 W. Campbell Street east of the Campbell drive aisle and north of the Highland drive aisle.
- 10) Provide landscaping adjacent to the screen wall for the loading area that is located south of 225 S. Campbell near Highland.
The revisions are noted.

- 11) The streetscape along Campbell and Highland must be consistent with the Downtown details/streetscape.
The response is noted; however, please incorporate the details within the plans.
- 12) As more detailed plans are provided additional comments may be forthcoming.
The response is noted.
- 13) Provide an interim landscape plan for each phase.
Please provide the interim landscape plan.
- 14) Landscaping has been removed along the south property line in the southwest corner adjacent to the drive. Per Chapter 28, a six foot high screen is required since the site is zoned B-5 and is adjacent to the residential district. Please incorporate upright evergreen trees if space permits or request a variation. If evergreen trees are provided, the placement must consider site lines.
- 15) Along the south property line adjacent to the parking garage provide a decorative metal fence. Previously a fence was shown on the plan.
- 16) Along Campbell Street and Highland please include pavers within the drive aisle for the portion that is part of the pedestrian walkway. The pavers should match the downtown streetscape.

ARLINGTON 425 – PC#: 19-001
PETITIONER RESPONSES TO ROUND 2 COMMENTS
MARCH 15, 2019

RESPONSES TO FIRE SAFETY DIVISION COMMENTS

1. The fire lane for the south Highland building (high rise) shall be a hard surface approved by the Fire Chief capable of supporting the loads of fire apparatus to include point loads generated from outriggers of the aerial truck. Soft turf of any kind is not an approved surface.

Response: Duly noted. Petitioner will utilize brick pavers for the fire lane between the Highland Building and the Chestnut Building. As an alternative, Petitioner believes that Tufftrack Model No. TT-24, reinforced lawn pavers, which have a compressive strength of 81,744 pounds per square foot, would be an equally effective and more aesthetically pleasing option. Petitioner will discuss this alternative with Staff and the Fire Department, and will comply with the final decision of both.

2. All fire lanes shall be of appropriate width without encroaching into adjacent use areas and shall be maintained free from the parking/standing of any vehicle at any time. Appropriate fire lane signage shall be placed along the routes of all fire lanes.

Response: Agreed. The revised plans show that the drop-off area north of the Chestnut Building has been removed. In addition, the drive north of the Highland Building has been widened to provide an unobstructed 26' fire lane in addition to the drop-off area. Signage for fire lanes and parking shall be provided as determined with Staff.

3. Elevated curbs crossing fire lanes shall not be approved. Entrances to fire lanes from other areas or fire lanes shall be of minimal elevation to prevent compromise of apparatus mounting elevated surfaces.

Response: Understood and agree. The auto turn diagrams for inbound fire truck maneuvers are on driving surfaces. The overhang of the vehicle will encroach on the adjacent curbing, which will be designed to be free of any obstruction. The auto turn diagrams have been updated accordingly.

4. Provide a detailed explanation showing how the east side of the building along Highland will be accessible in order to meet the requirement that all first floor areas be accessible within 150 feet of fire apparatus/hose lines.

Response: The entire length of the Highland Building from north to south measures 244 feet. A fire truck located on the north and south side of the

Highland Building can collectively cover more than 150 feet, as can two fire trucks parked on the west side of the Highland Building on the north and south ends of the fire lane.

5. Provide acknowledgment that the fire lane provided for the Highland Building along the west side shall not be removed for any reason once it is established. It is believed there was discussion about removing this area prior to the second phase of the project and that this would not be permitted, however, no comments were provided acknowledging the understanding that this would not be allowed.

Response: Acknowledged and agreed. The fire lane provided on the west side of the Highland Building will not be removed for any reason once it has been constructed.

6. It is requested that language be added to the ordinance that would prevent the erection of any structure or placement of any obstruction into the fire lane along the west side of the Highland building.

Response: Understood and agreed. No structure or obstruction shall be in the 26' wide fire lane on the west side of the Highland Building.

ARLINGTON 425 – PC#: 19-001
PETITIONER RESPONSES TO ROUND 2 COMMENTS
March 15, 2019

RESPONSES TO FIRE DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

1. The fire lane between the Highland and Chestnut building needs to be free of obstructions and run the entire length of the building. The use of reinforced lawn pavers is not acceptable.

Response: Petitioner will utilize brick pavers for the fire lane. Plans have been revised accordingly. As an alternative, Petitioner believes that Tufftrack Model No. TT-24, reinforced lawn pavers, which have a compressive strength of 81,744 pounds per square foot, would be an equally effective and more aesthetically pleasing option. Petitioner will discuss this alternative with Staff and the Fire Department.

2. The auto turn diagram for the fire truck shows the use of the circle. Please provide more information as to how the circle is going to be built. The use of a "mountable fire lane" as is not acceptable.

Response: The circle will not include a "mountable fire lane". The plans have been revised to remove the note describing the "mountable fire lane", which will be renamed a "flat curb".

3. The auto turn diagram shows the truck using some areas that don't appear to be driving surfaces. For example, the inbound truck maneuver from Highland. The front overhang of the basket needs to also have a clear path.

Response: We believe that this issue has been eliminated with the redesign of the required Fire Lane. Please see the revised drawing.

ARLINGTON 425 – PC#: 19-001
PETITIONER RESPONSES TO ROUND 2 COMMENTS
MARCH 15, 2019

RESPONSES TO PLANNING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMENTS

General:

74. The response to Comment #7 is noted. Based on a review of the revised plans, the following additional or amended approvals are needed:
- a. Variation to Chapter 28, Section 5.1-14.2, Required Minimum Yards, to allow a 12.2' setback along a public street frontage (Chestnut Street) for the Chestnut building where code requires a 20' setback.
 - b. Variation to Chapter 28, Section 5.1-14.2, Required Minimum Yards, to allow a 12'9" setback along an interior lot line (southern lot line) for the Highland building where code requires a 25' setback.
 - c. Variation to Chapter 28, Section 10.2-7, Size, to allow certain parking spaces within the Highland building garage to be 15.3' in depth where code requires 18' in depth.
 - d. Variation to Chapter 28, Section 6.15-2.2, Landscape Requirements between Zoning Districts, to waive the requirement for a 6-foot tall solid screen along the southern property line.

Response: Duly noted.

75. The response to Comment #9 is noted. A condition of approval will be recommended that shall require the recording of bylaws or covenants that established shared access and shared parking for the development should portions of the subject property be sold to separate owners.

Response: Duly noted.

76. The response to Comment #11 is noted. Please note that the project narrative refers to a "Special Use Permit" and "Written Justification for Special Use" for the "all residential" Chestnut building. The specific approval needed for the Chestnut building is a Land Use Variation (not a Special Use), and the project narrative and approval justification should be revised accordingly. Please note that approval criteria for a Land Use Variation is different than that for a Special Use Permit. Finally, please revise the previously submitted justification for variations to reflect the actual variations requested per #74 above, and please provide justifications for the newly identified variation.

Response: Duly noted. Petitioner's revised narrative and revised justifications are included in two letters that will be submitted to the Planning Department simultaneously with these responses.

77. The response to Comment #15 is not acceptable. We have not received the Power Construction site staging and logistics plan. Please provide this plan and note that the plan must identify preliminary estimates of any lane closures and closure timeframes. Since the description of what will be constructed in Phase 1 is vague, our comment asked for clarification on what will be constructed in each phase. Please outline, specifically, all infrastructure (both onsite and off-site), and common areas that will be constructed in Phase 1 and in Phase 2. Finally, please address how fire protection will be provided to the Highland Building if the underground garage for the Chestnut building causes the temporary removal of this fire lane.

Response: The Power Construction site staging and logistics plan is enclosed. During Phase I, we expect to close the parking lanes along Highland and Chestnut for a 9 to 12 month period. During Phase II (the Chestnut Building), we would close about 300 feet of the Chestnut parking lane for 6 to 9 months. All site infrastructure will be constructed during Phase I. This will include any portion of the Chestnut Building underground garage that will be under the fire lane between the Highland Building and the Chestnut Building. Once constructed, it will not be closed, removed, or obstructed at any time

78. The response to Comment #21 is not sufficient. Please revise the plans to show a 26' wide one-way fire lane, which will require the existing proposed 17' wide lane to extend to the north. A condition of approval will be recommended that will require the developer to implement two-way travel along this drive aisle if, after construction, it is determined that two-way travel is necessary for adequate circulation and traffic flow. Please verify if the underground connection in this location has the structural ability to support the two-way drive aisle.

Response: The plans have been revised to show the referenced 26' fire lane as unobstructed. This drive is to remain one-way in only.

79. The response to Comment #25 is not sufficient. The two loading spaces and garage access along Highland Avenue will result in the loss of at least nine public parking spaces and will result in congestion and truck turning movements adjacent to one of the entrances to the Vail Avenue garage. Please remove the two loading spaces and relocate them elsewhere on the interior of the site. Other options include:

- Placing them in the area where bike parking is located within the Highland building garage.
- To the west of the bike racks within the Highland building garage where the parcel pickup space is located.
- Locating them in a portion of the 2,869 sq. ft. space that is currently designated as retail within the Highland building.

Response: Petitioner seeks to minimize, to the greatest extent possible, the addition of more traffic onto Highland Avenue. Putting a loading zone near the main entrance to the Highland Building would create a bottle neck from loading trucks backing in and

out. Additionally, relocating to the north side of the building will cause traffic back up to the main entry to the development and create a visual disruption to the main building entry. The best location for the loading docks is under the existing Vail Avenue parking garage across from the drive aisles into the Vail Avenue parking garage. These loading areas are recessed and cause the least effect to the traffic flow.

80. The response to Comment #26 is noted. The Planning Dept. and Engineering Division are evaluating if certain spaces along Campbell may remain.

Response: Duly noted. Petitioner awaits the evaluation of the Planning Department and Engineering Division and will comply.

81. The response to Comment #27 is noted. A 6' tall solid screen (landscaping, fence, or berm) is required along the southern property line to comply with the screening requirements between zoning districts, or a variation is required. Please provide the required justification for this approval. The 42" tall fence in the exterior side yard in front of the Chestnut building must be an "open" style fence.

Response: This item is in progress. The most current landscape details have been included for reference. It is noted that the south fence adjacent to the fire lane and the Highland Building shall be solid, and the south fence adjacent to the Chestnut Building shall be open. Details will be updated accordingly as the project progresses.

82. The response to Comment #31 and #32 is noted. Since no details have been provided, a condition of approval will be recommended that will require all utility service lines to be underground, all ground mounted utility and mechanical equipment (switchgears, generators, transformers, etc.) to be appropriately located and screened, and all building mounted utility infrastructure (meters, utility/FDC connections, etc.) to be appropriately located and screened.

Response: Duly noted and will comply. Utilities will be properly screened as necessary.

83. The response to Comment #32 is noted. Since no preliminary analysis has been provided, a condition of approval will be recommended that prohibits all construction activities from damaging the Vail Avenue garage. A full structural analysis and soil borings will be required at time of building permit. The Village reserves the right to review any proposed modifications to the Vail Avenue garage and the ability to require certain upgrades to the garage as necessary to facilitate the proposed development (e.g. additional interior lighting, re-routing of electrical lines, etc.). Costs of any garage modifications, insurance, and bonds shall be the developers responsibility.

Response: Duly noted. A site staging and logistics plan has been provided. Retaining the structural integrity of the Vail Avenue garage is of paramount importance. No damage will occur to the Vail Avenue garage during construction of the Highland


Avenue garage, but modifications to non-bearing wall panels will be required at the loading dock area. These will be designed by a structural engineer and shall be subject to the Village approval.

84. The response to Comment #35 is noted. Staff is evaluating restrictions that would be placed on move-in/move-out days, times and locations.

Response: Duly noted. Petitioner awaits Staff's evaluation.

85. The response to Comment #42 is noted. The 140'-0" measurement is not accurate based on the code definition of building height. The code definition does not include the parapet wall. Provide an elevation and height measurement from elevation 697.00 at the north façade adjacent to the front entrance, which is what we've interpreted the established grade to be opposite the middle of the front of the building. See graphic below for clarification:

Response: Architect plans will be revised to indicate 140' measurement from elevation 697.00 to the top of the roof.



86. The response to Comment #45 is not sufficient. Please provide on the plans details for the screen walls (height, material, compatibility to building architecture, style and appearance of gates, etc.).

Response: Please see the revised plans. The elevations for the Campbell Building on Sheets CA.3 and CA.4 have been revised to include the details for the screen walls around the loading zones.

87. The response to Comment #47 is noted. A condition of approval will be recommended that would prohibit the Campbell Building and the Highland Building from being converted to condominiums unless an amendment to the PUD is approved.

Response: Duly noted. Petitioner does not currently anticipate converting any part of Campbell Building or the Highland Building into condominiums.

88. The response to Comment #53 is noted. Based on the new area of ROW dedication, the building setback at the southeast of the property needs to jog in to accommodate for this ROW area. Please revise the plat to make this change.

Response: Duly noted. Please see the revised plans.

89. The response to Comment #55 is noted. The parking table on pages 39-41 do not include the newly shown auxiliary basement retail space within the Campbell Building. Please revise the parking study to accommodate for this new retail space. The “Arlington 425 Unit Mix Parking” document should be revised to be consistent with the square footages as shown within the parking study.

Response: The auxiliary basement space will be used solely as a storage and food preparation area for the first floor retail. This area does not require parking per the Village ordinance therefore was not included in the parking analysis. The “Arlington 425 Unit Mix Parking” includes the most current square footage information. The parking study will be revised to coordinate.

90. The response to Comment #66 and #67 does not provide enough specificity to address the comments. Before we can make a recommendation on this project, a detailed parking plan outlining how parking will function is required. Please provide said plan. The plan must explain how parking for the commercial, restaurant, and office uses will be accommodated, as well as the residential portion of the development. The Highland building will provide shared parking as per the KLOA study and an explanation detailing how these spaces will be shared is therefore necessary. Will certain spaces be designated for residential parking only or commercial/office parking only? How many spaces will be allocated to residential uses vs. commercial/office uses (both customer and employees)? How will access to these spaces be restricted and monitored? Will all spaces be open to any user? All residential parking shall be unbundled. What system will be in place to collect payment for parking? Will parking be free for customers and employees of the businesses?

Response: The parking between the residential and retail/commercial users will be controlled by an electronic control system and access/entry gates. The residential access will be controlled by a FOB system with access off of Highland Avenue and the north building entry. Within the garage, the residential parking will be on the upper levels and accessed through a second gate. If a residential user does not utilize

the second gate to park, they will be restricted from exiting. The second gate can be adjusted depending on the actual number of residential parking spaces utilized from time to time. The current plan is that resident parking spaces will not be assigned.

Retail/commercial and resident guest parking will enter from the north side of the building using a gated ticket system. For residential guests and customers of the development's retail/commercial users, exiting will be through a validation or pay system. The exact amount of charges for parking, if any, will be determined subject to market conditions. Petitioner has engaged Walker Parking Consultants to advise and assist in the design and operation of the Highland garage. The Petitioner will use the most efficient and up to date technology to control the access, circulation and separation of the parking between the building residents and non-residents.

91. The response to Comment #73 is noted. The parking charts provided show only weekday parking demand. In previous shared parking analyses that have been provided to the Village on other mixed use projects, they have shown residential parking spaces at 90%-98% occupancy after 6:00pm on a weekday and weekend, whereas the parking study shows between 72% and 82% parking space occupancy on a weekday (with no weekend data provided). Additionally, these studies have shown a higher peak parking demand for restaurants during the weekend as opposed to weekday. Please address these two points. Under two of the shared parking scenarios ("modified" Village Code + ITE and ITE only), please analyze the weekend parking demand to determine if there is adequate shared capacity on the weekends.

Response: The TIS was updated to include parking analysis for the weekday parking demand under the two requested shared parking scenarios. Under both scenarios, the peak parking demand occurs at 7:00 PM, which is when both the restaurant uses and the residential uses are peaking. For the ITE only scenario, the analysis shows a parking surplus of 54 parking spaces. For the "modified" Code + ITE requested scenario, the analysis shows a parking deficit of approximately 86 parking spaces. It is important to note that the parking analysis assumes all "new" vehicles arriving for the non-residential uses, rather than applying a reduction for patrons of these uses that may live in the development itself or nearby that may arrive by walking, or may use another form of transportation that does not require a parking space. The requested parking analyses are attached and will be included in the revised, forthcoming TIS pending traffic related comments from the Village Public Works and/or Engineering departments.

ARLINGTON 425 – PC#: 19-001
PETITIONER RESPONSES TO ROUND 2 COMMENTS
MARCH 15, 2019

RESPONSES TO LANDSCAPING COMMENTS

1. Provide additional foundation plantings along Highland and Campbell.
The revisions are noted and per the response, movable plants will be provided.

Response: No response required.

2. Provide a detail of the proposed fence and retaining wall along the south property line.
Please include details as part of the plans.

Response: This item is in progress. The most current landscape details have been included for reference. It is noted that the south fence adjacent to the fire lane and the Highland Building shall be solid, and the south fence adjacent to the Chestnut Building shall be open. Details will be updated accordingly as the project progresses.

3. Along the south elevation of 44 S. Highland incorporate ornamental trees and shrubs in order to soften the large span of wall. In addition, provide shade trees on the north elevation of 44 S. Highland.
The revisions are noted.

Response: No response required.

4. On the landscape plan, indicate the location of the below grade parking and the outline of the detention area.
The revisions are noted.

Response: No response required.

5. Provide additional screening adjacent to the transformer that is located south of 225 W. Campbell Street. In addition, provide a utility plan that identifies all mechanical units that are located at grade and indicate how they will be screened. All utilities must be fully screened with landscaping.
The revisions are noted.

Response: No response required.

6. In order to soften the mass of the proposed building at 33 S. Chestnut, incorporate ornamental trees along the west elevation.
The revisions are noted.

Response: No response required.

7. Provide a site furnishings package. It is recommended that large free standing planters be provided on the private property along Campbell and Highland.
Please include details as part of the plans.

Response: This item is in progress. The most current landscape details are included for reference. Products and details will be updated accordingly as the project progresses.

8. Along Campbell and Highland incorporate bump outs at the corners and adjacent to each drive aisle.
As part of the plans, incorporate the bump-outs along Campbell Street and Highland.

Response: Petitioner shall coordinate all street parking and potential curb bump-outs with Staff Departments in the future and as approved.

9. Along Campbell and Highland there is a large spans of brick pavers between the back of curb and the proposed building. It is recommended that the area be further evaluated and that raised planters similar to the planters along Harmony Park be incorporated. In addition, it is recommended that the space at the corner be evaluated. This is a focal point and the space should be further developed.
Please evaluate the corner area and incorporate relief through the use of planters. This is a focal point and the space should be further developed. It is recommended that raised planters similar to the planters along Harmony Park be incorporated along Campbell and Highland in front of 225 W. Campbell Street east of the Campbell drive aisle and north of the Highland drive aisle.

Response: Bump-outs can be shown as landscaped with the same ornamental railing used at Harmony Park.

10. Provide landscaping adjacent to the screen wall for the loading area that is located south of 225 S. Campbell near Highland.
The revisions are noted.

Response: No response required.

11. The streetscape along Campbell and Highland must be consistent with the Downtown details/streetscape.
The response is noted; however, please incorporate the details within the plans.

Response: This item is in progress. The most current landscape details are included for reference. Products and details will be updated accordingly as the project progresses.

12. As more detailed plans are provided additional comments may be forthcoming.
The response is noted.

Response: No response required.

13. Provide an interim landscape plan for each phase.
Please provide the interim landscape plan.

Response: The interim landscape and planting plan has been provided for reference. If phasing is changed in the future, a revised plan will be provided.

14. Landscaping has been removed along the south property line in the southwest corner adjacent to the drive. Per Chapter 28, a six foot high screen is required since the site is zoned B-5 and is adjacent to the residential district. Please incorporate upright evergreen trees if space permits or request a variation. If evergreen trees are provided, the placement must consider site lines.

Response: A fence (opaque in style) is indicated on the plan. In-progress details have been included for reference and will be updated as the project progresses to indicate the requested six foot screen fence.

15. Along the south property line adjacent to the parking garage provide a decorative metal fence. Previously a fence was shown on the plan.

Response: A fence (opaque in style) is indicated on the plan. In-progress details have been included for reference and will be updated as the project progresses to indicate the requested six foot screen fence.

16. Along Campbell Street and Highland please include pavers within the drive aisle for the portion that is part of the pedestrian walkway. The pavers should match the downtown streetscape.

Response: Duly noted and agree. The plans will be revised accordingly.

ARLINGTON 425 – PC#: 19-001
PETITIONER RESPONSES TO ROUND 2 COMMENTS
MARCH 15, 2019

RESPONSES TO ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

75. The petitioner's response to Comment Nos. 11 through 17 are acceptable.

Response: No response required.

76. The petitioner's response to Comment No. 18 is not acceptable. Although an exhibit has been added to show fire access to the courtyard between the Chestnut Ave. and Highland Ave. buildings, there are still issues with the maneuvers shown at several other locations. The drop off lanes shall not be considered part of the necessary 26 ft fire lane. Revise the plans accordingly.

Response: The drive aisle geometry north of the Highland Building has been revised so that the fire lane width is 26 feet exclusive of the drop-off lane. The drop-off lane north of the Chestnut Building has been removed. Please see Sheet 3 of the revised preliminary engineering plan set. The auto turn diagrams are updated and included in the revised Traffic Impact Study.

77. The petitioner's response to Comment No. 19 is noted. The existing conditions of the portion of Highland Ave. under the parking garage have been added to the preliminary engineering plans, however; they are not shown on the plat. Revise the plat accordingly.

Response: The existing conditions under the Highland Ave. garage have been added to the revised Preliminary Plat of Subdivision.

78. The petitioner's response to Comment No. 20 is acceptable.

Response: No response required.

79. The petitioner's response to Comment No. 21 is not acceptable. Per Comment No. 76, the drop off lanes shall not be considered part of the necessary 26 ft wide fire lane. The maneuvers provided for all trucks appear to still be problematic and several of the maneuvers conflict with the drop off lane and mountable center median. The fire lanes shall be revised to 26 ft minimum and all exhibits revised accordingly.

Response: Fire lanes have been revised and no longer have issues with drop off zones. The auto turn diagrams are updated and included in the revised traffic impact study.

80. The petitioner's response to Comment No. 22 is noted. The structural number provided references a concrete layer coefficient of 0.50. Provide additional information from the manufacturer and/or a Structural Engineer verifying that the layer coefficient for the

heavy duty pavers is equivalent to the concrete layer coefficient. It should also be clarified that the structural number applies to both the permeable pavers and the brick pavers in the fire lane. The heavy duty pavement section must also be shown on the fire truck maneuver exhibits, on the geometric plan and the details. Revise the plans accordingly. The reinforced lawn is not acceptable. The plans shall be revised to provide a hard surface that meets or exceeds the structural number of the Village's heavy duty pavement section. Provide the cross section for the underground parking and fire lane.

Response: Plans have been revised to include the requested brick paver fire lane within the courtyard. Cross sections for the underground parking and fire lane will be provided as part of construction documents. Additionally, the auto turn diagrams are updated and included in the revised TIS. As an alternative to brick pavers, Petitioner believes that Tufftrack Model No. TT-24, reinforced lawn pavers, which have a compressive strength of 81,744 per square foot, would be an equally effective and more aesthetically pleasing option. Petitioner will discuss this alternative with Staff and the Fire Department.

81. The petitioner's response to Comment No. 23 is not acceptable. See Comment No. 80.

Response: Plans have been revised to include the requested brick paver fire lane within the courtyard. Cross sections for the underground parking and fire lane will be provided as part of construction documents. Additionally, the auto turn diagrams are updated and included in the revised TIS. As an alternative to brick pavers, Petitioner believes that Tufftrack Model No. TT-24, reinforced lawn pavers, which have a compressive strength of 81,744 per square foot, would be an equally effective and more aesthetically pleasing option. Petitioner will discuss this alternative with Staff and the Fire Department.

82. The petitioner's response to Comment No. 24 is noted. The adjoining property has not submitted preliminary plans for staff to review and Comment. The Village would have a similar request of the adjoining property to coordinate cross-access with Arlington 425. When revising the site plan, the possibility of cross-access should still be taken into consideration.

Response: Duly noted.

83. The petitioner's response to Comment Nos. 25 through 29 are acceptable.

Response: No response required.

84. The petitioner's response to Comment No. 30 is noted. The retaining wall shall not be located on the property line, assess the possibility of accounting for the change in elevation at the garage. If a retaining wall is still necessary, the maximum height shall be 3 ft. Provide a detail of the retaining wall and footing. Revise the grading and proposed elevations accordingly.

Response: Duly noted. The final design and details for the south retaining wall will be included in the final engineering submittal.

85. The petitioner's response to Comment Nos. 31 through 32 is acceptable.

Response: No response required.

86. The petitioner's response to Comment No. 33 is not acceptable. The fire access between the Chestnut Ave. and Highland Ave. buildings must be fully constructed in Phase I and not disturbed by Phase II. Provide preliminary Phase I and Phase II plans.

Response: A site logistics plan has been provided. The fire access between the Chestnut Ave. and Highland Ave. buildings will be constructed in Phase I and will not be closed, removed or obstructed during Phase II construction. Construction documents will be provided as soon as they are available.

87. The petitioner's response to Comment No. 34 is noted. Provide the service plans from the respective utilities as they become available.

Response: Duly noted. The utility service plans will be provided to the Village as soon as they are available.

88. The sidewalk along Chestnut Ave., at the south end, should continue at 1 ft from the new right-of-way and not angle back to the current alignment, including through the 35 S Chestnut driveway. Revise the plans accordingly and adjust the grades as necessary for the new location of the sidewalk through the driveway. Future development of the adjoining property will address the remaining section of sidewalk.

Response: Please see the revised plans. The sidewalk along Chestnut Ave. has been revised as requested.

89. The Village is considering constructing a north/south pedestrian crossing of Campbell St. at the SE corner of Highland Ave. and Campbell St., possibly by installing a "bump out". The petitioner is made aware that this may affect the alignment of the sidewalk ramp at the SW corner of Highland Ave. and Campbell St. Any necessary modifications to the plans can be addressed at final engineering.

Response: Duly noted.

Preliminary Plat of Subdivision:

90. The petitioner's response to Comment No. 35 is noted. Provide the length for the 8' wide dedication south of the garage.

Response: The length for the 8' wide dedication south of the garage has been added to the Preliminary Plat of Subdivision.

91. The petitioner's response to Comment Nos. 36 and 37 are acceptable.

Response: No response required.

92. In reference to Comment No. 77, revise the preliminary plat to show the existing conditions of the Highland Ave. R.O.W. area under the Vail Street Garage.

Response: The existing conditions under the Highland Ave. garage have been added to the revised Preliminary Plat of Subdivision.

Traffic:

93. The petitioner's responses to Comments 38, 40, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 52, 54, 55, 56, 58, 59, 60, 64, 65, 66, 68, 71, 72 are satisfactory.

Response: No response required.

94. The response provided by the petitioner to Comment #39 is noted. The existing radii at the S.E. corner of Campbell St. and Chestnut Ave. and the S.W. corner of Campbell St. and Highland Ave. is less than 25 ft. The corners can remain provided no changes are planned, however; in the event that corner bump outs are installed for ADA ramps, the corners must have a minimum back of curb radius of 25 ft.

Response: Duly noted.

95. The petitioner's response to Comment #41 is noted. The exhibit showing the site triangles supports a recommendation to establish all-way stop at the intersection of Campbell St. and Highland Ave. Refer also to Comments #89 and #94.

Response: The Traffic Impact Study has been revised to support all-way stop sign control at the Campbell/Highland intersection.

96. The response provided by the petitioner to Comment #42 is not satisfactory. The geometric layout of on-street parking stalls does not comply with these Illinois Rules of the Road setbacks. Revise geometric plan accordingly.

Response: The plan has been revised accordingly.

97. The response provided by the petitioner to Comment #51 is not satisfactory. The last statement made suggests that the south Highland parking garage driveway volumes are higher than the driveway out of the N.W. corner of the Highland building. However Figure 7 does not support this contention.

Response: A majority of the residential traffic (approximately two-thirds) is estimated to use the exclusive residential southerly access drive on Highland Avenue. Please refer to Figure 7A located in the Appendix of the Traffic Impact Study which shows the assignment of residential traffic only. Please refer to Figure 7B located in the Appendix of the Traffic Impact Study which shows the assignment of non-residential

traffic.

98. The response provided by the petitioner to Comment #53 is not satisfactory. The comment made disregards the 4 sentences requesting explanation of truck operations, anticipated volumes of truck deliveries, moving operations, and service and refuse activities that will occur. Additionally, discussion about anticipated truck delivery operation times should be provided that distribute and stage vehicles, and insure compliance with code noise and nuisance controls. The plans and exhibits shall be revised to show the new location of the loading docks.

Response: The first phase will have a property manager who will schedule all truck movements between the loading areas and adjacent buildings. Generally, trash pickup is in the early morning hours to avoid conflict with vehicular traffic, and other deliveries can be restricted to certain hours to avoid conflicts with move-ins and outs. The exhibits have been revised to show the proposed loading areas. Petitioner is working with property management on loading issues.

99. The response provided by the petitioner to Comment #57 is noted. Provide a preliminary construction staging plan at final engineering, a final construction staging plan will be required for permit.

Response: Duly noted and will comply.

100. The response provided by the petitioner to Comment #61 is satisfactory.

Response: No response required.

101. The response provided by the petitioner to Comment #62 is not satisfactory. Please identify where in the traffic report the utilization, designation, and operation of the on-site parking/drop off lanes is managed or regulated. Condo declarations or site management documents that clearly indicate movement of goods by utilization of the truck loading bays, or these on-site surface zones, to keep this activity off of the public streets.

Response: The Traffic Impact Study notes the location and uses of the on-site parking/drop off lanes under the Internal Circulation section of the report. Petitioner does not anticipate that any portion of the Highland Building or the Campbell Building will be converted to condominiums, although site management documents will clearly indicate that goods are to be moved via truck loading bays, or on-site surface zones.

102. The response provided by the petitioner to Comment #63 is not satisfactory. There is no sight triangle diagram for the south Highland Building driveway contained in the report.

Response: The sight triangle diagram exhibit (Figure G) is included in the appendix of the updated Traffic Impact Study.

103. The response provided by the petitioner to Comment #67 is not satisfactory. Again the

relocation of more traffic to the north Highland Building garage, rather than the south driveway results in more traffic moving towards the north. There still are a couple of arithmetic errors for the Campbell street driveway, and not summing correctly at the Chestnut @ Campbell intersection, as well as the Highland driveway into the site.

Response: The residential assignment (Figure 7A) included in the appendix of the Traffic Impact Study shows that approximately two-thirds of the residential traffic will enter from the southerly access drive off Highland Avenue. The Traffic Impact Study was revised with respect to volume balancing between intersections on Campbell Street and Highland Avenue.

104. The response provided by the petitioner to Comment #69 is not satisfactory. It is understood that the values have been corrected, and that original entries into the Synchro analysis did utilize the proper traffic volumes. However in the description of the intersection Levels of Service, the impact of bicyclist and pedestrian confluence is not represented or factored into the delay calculations.

Response: The capacity analyses were conducted using Synchro/SimTraffic software, which uses HCM methodology. As noted in the Traffic Impact Study, under projected conditions the pedestrian volumes were increased at all intersections for all approaches to account for increased pedestrian activity which are reflected in the resulting delays and levels of service

105. The response provided by the petitioner to Comment #70 is not satisfactory. Based upon the values evaluated, were any intersection modifications, channelization changes, pedestrian crosswalk, or sidewalk revisions indicated? It shall also be noted that the updated weekend and evening counts were conducted in February. Pedestrian and vehicular traffic is likely greater on weekends and evenings in warmer weather.

Response The Traffic Impact Study recommends consideration of all-way stop sign control at the intersections of Highland Avenue at both Campbell Street and Sigwalt Street, high-visibility crosswalks to be provided across proposed access drives, and removal of on-street parking spaces to improve sightlines along Campbell Street. It is important to note that previous counts were conducted in June 2018 at the intersection of Highland Avenue and Campbell Street. A comparison of those counts to the recent counts conducted in February 2019 shows that the traffic volumes and pedestrian volumes were higher in the February count compared to the counts in June. Please refer to Table A below.

Table A

Highland Avenue and Campbell Street

Time	Vehicles		Pedestrians/Bicycles	
	June 2018	February 2019	June 2018	February 2019
5:00 PM	425	502	29	59

106. The response provided by the petitioner to Comment #73 is noted. The Planning Department is supportive of a condition to restrict move-in, move-out loading operations in the drop off zone. The Engineering Division concurs with this assessment. A provision should be contained in the Approved Village Ordinance prohibiting loading operations along Chestnut Avenue.

Response: Duly noted.

107. The response provided by the petitioner to Comment #74 is not satisfactory. There are several factors not addressed, and a confusing representation of the parking analysis that need to be redefined as identified below:

- a.) The traffic report suggests that for Transit Oriented Developments, (TOD) a 15% reduction is feasible, but it is unclear if this is an ITE study, or based upon the values in Table 6. If based upon Table 6 summary, there are too many variables that cannot be evaluated for these locations that may have factors to compensate parking in these towns by other methods. Please clarify if any parking reduction is applied as part of the study recommendations.

Response: No reduction was applied in the parking analysis. The 15% TOD reduction is based on US Census data and was only applied to the vehicle trip generation/traffic impact portion of the study.

- b.) The shared parking analyzes shown in Tables 7, 8, & 9, are confusing related to the following:

- How were Retail, Restaurant, and Office values calculated in Table 7
- Showing the total site parking requirement but including the 33 S. Chestnut building which is not part of the shared parking analysis is confusing.
- Provide the ITE parking rates that justify the values shown in Table 8.
- Why are the residential values between table 7 & 9 the same, and what is the difference that is trying to be shown?

Response: The shared parking analysis was originally conducted and was recently expanded in the updated Traffic Impact Study (refer to Comment #91 issued by the Planning and Community Development Department) to include the following five

scenarios.

- Village Code only (Table 7 in TIS). The residential is based on 1.5 parking spaces per residential unit. The Unit Mix Parking spreadsheet that tabulates the parking spaces that are required for each individual land use based on Village Code as well as the ULI hourly distributions are included in the Appendix of the TIS.
- ITE only for weekday conditions (Table 8 in TIS). The shared parking analysis uses the ITE rates and ULI hourly distribution for weekday conditions. ITE rates and ULI hourly distributions are included in the Appendix of the TIS.
- Village Code and ITE for weekday conditions (Table 9 in TIS). The shared parking analysis is based on Village Code for residential parking (1.5 spaces per unit) and ITE rates for the non-residential uses for weekday conditions. Hourly distribution for all land uses is based on hourly data provided by ULI.
- ITE/ULI only for weekend conditions (Table 10 in TIS). The shared parking analysis uses ITE and ULI rates and ULI hourly distributions for weekend conditions. The respective rates and ULI hourly distributions are included in the Appendix of the TIS.
- Village Code and ITE for weekend conditions. The shared parking analysis is based on Village Code for residential parking (1.5 spaces per unit) and ITE rates for the non-residential uses for weekend conditions. Hourly distribution for all land uses is based on hourly data provided by ULI (Table 11 in TIS).

Further, the tables were updated to eliminate the Chestnut Building parking (which is part of the development, but not part of the shared parking analysis), and supporting rates/hourly distributions are included in the Appendix

108. Bullets #5 & #6 in the conclusions contradict the findings, and responses provided in the previous comments listed above.

Response: The Conclusions section of the Traffic Impact Study has been updated accordingly.

ARLINGTON 425 – PC#: 19-001
PETITIONER RESPONSES TO ROUND 2 COMMENTS
MARCH 15, 2019

RESPONSES TO PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

1. Submit details for the underground detention basin and restricted outfall.

Response: The final details of the Highland Building including the details for the underground detention basin will be included in the final architectural/structural plans for the building. The outlet control structure detail is included on the preliminary utility plan. Please see Sheet 5.

2. Submit a maintenance plan for the underground detention basin and restricted outfall.

Response: The requested maintenance plan will be included in the final engineering submittal and as part of the Schedule R and Exhibit R documents for the MWRDGC WMO permit application for the project.

3. The Village has an underground conduit for fiber optic and copper cable (communications). It is located within the east parkway of Chestnut between the sidewalk and curb. This must be reflected in the survey.

Response: These lines will be incorporated into the existing conditions as part of the final engineering plans for the project.

4. The connection to the existing (abandoned) combined/storm sewer must verify or complete the proper abandonment/plugging to the north.

Response: This will be noted on the final engineering plans for the project.

5. Show complete site contours indicating rainfall overflow direction.

Response: The existing site contours have been included on the Preliminary Grading Plan. Please see Sheet 4. The lowest existing adjacent right-of-way elevations are located at the southeast corner of the site. Proposed condition overland flow arrows have been added to the preliminary grading plan. The overflow discharge location will be through the proposed outlet control structure located at the southeast corner of the site, towards the Highland Avenue right-of-way.

6. The Village requires structural review and field verification of the existing Vail Garage footings to be included in design of Highland Building.

Response: It is understood that the Village will require structural review and field verification of the existing Vail Garage footings will be required as part of the design

of the Highland Building parking garage. Required documentation will be provided as part of the Construction Documents and amended if/as necessary during excavation for construction.

7. The Village needs plans and structural approval of all modifications needed to existing garage. It appears that changes are needed to accommodate the loading bays and south entrance onto Highland.

Response: It is understood that the Village will require plans and structural approval of all modifications needed to the existing Vail Garage. Required documentation will be provided as part of the Construction Documents.



**Village of Arlington Heights
Building & Life Safety Department**

RECEIVED
JAN 29 2019
PLANNING & COMMUNITY
DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

Interoffice Memorandum

To: Sam Hubbard, Development Planner, Planning and Community Development

From: Deb Pierce, Plan Reviewer, Building & Life Safety Department

Subject: Arlington 425 – PUD, Preliminary Plat of Subdivision, Rezoning from R-1 to B-5, LUV for Apartment Building, Variations

PC#: 19-001 – Round 1

Date: January 23, 2019

General Comments:

The information provided is conceptual only and subject to a formal plan review.

The following comments apply to 44 S. Highland and 225 W. Campbell:

1. Clearly indicate on the plans all property lines.
2. The buildings shall be classified as high-rise, and meet all the requirements in 2009 IBC Section 403.
3. Provide the proposed construction type for each building.
4. Exterior wall ratings shall meet the requirements of 2009 IBC Table 602.
5. Each building will be reviewed as separated mixed use of S-2, M, and R-2 Provide the proposed hourly separation between each use per 2009 IBC Table 508.4.
6. Separation for incidental use areas shall follow the requirements of 2009 IBC Table 508.2.5.
7. The buildings shall comply with the 2018 Illinois Accessibility Code which went into effect on November 1, 2018.
8. Provide a height and area calculation for each building.
9. A Fire Command Center shall be provided for each building per 2009 IBC 403.4.5, and meet the requirements of Section 911 of the IBC.
10. Provide the proposed construction type of the bridge at 225 W. Campbell.
11. At least one elevator in each building shall be provided for fire department emergency access to all floors. The elevator car shall be of such a size and arrangement to accommodate an ambulance stretcher in its horizontal, open position, provided the interior cab size shall not be less than **60 inches by 85 inches**, and shall be identified by the International Symbol for emergency medical services (Star of Life). The Symbol shall be not less than 3 inches high and shall be placed inside on both sides of the hoist-way door frame.
12. The trash termination rooms shall comply with the requirements of Table 508.2.5 and Section 708.13.1.
13. Provide a proposed occupant load for each building, including for the assembly uses on the roofs of each building.
14. Each building shall be provided the proper number of area of refuges with two-way communication and shall comply with the requirements of 2009 IBC Section 1007.6.
15. Provide details on the tunnel for the 44 S. Highland building. Where does the tunnel connect? Include construction details, dimensions, and distances to exits.

16. At the time of permit submittal for each building, structural calculations shall be provided for all structural components and any/all roof top elements, amenities.
17. Automatic smoke detection shall be provided and comply with IFC 907.2.13.

Note: This is not a complete and all-inclusive list.

The following comments apply to 33 S Chestnut:

1. Provide the proposed construction type for the building.
2. Exterior wall ratings shall meet the requirements of 2009 IBC Table 602.
3. The building will be reviewed as separated mixed use of S-2, and R-2.
4. Provide the proposed hourly separation between each use per 2009 IBC Table 508.4.
5. Separation for incidental use areas shall follow the requirements of 2009 IBC Table 508.2.5.
6. The building shall comply with the 2018 Illinois Accessibility Code which went into effect on November 1, 2018.
7. Provide a height and area calculation for the building.
8. At least one elevator in each building shall be provided for fire department emergency access to all floors. The elevator car shall be of such a size and arrangement to accommodate an ambulance stretcher in its horizontal, open position, provided the interior cab size shall not be less than **60 inches by 85 inches**, and shall be identified by the International Symbol for emergency medical services (Star of Life). The Symbol shall be not less than 3 inches high and shall be placed inside on both sides of the hoist-way door frame.
9. The trash termination room(s) shall comply with the requirements of Table 508.2.5 and Section 708.13.1.
10. Provide a proposed occupant load for the building, including for the assembly uses on the roof of the building.
11. The building shall be provided the proper number of area of refuges with two-way communication and shall comply with the requirements of 2009 IBC Section 1007.6.
12. At the time of permit submittal for the building, structural calculations shall be provided for all structural components and any/all roof top elements, amenities.

Note: This is not a complete and all-inclusive list.



**Village of Arlington Heights, IL
Department of Building & Life Safety**

Fire Safety Division

RECEIVED
JAN 24 2019
PLANNING & COMMUNITY
DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

Date: 1/24/2019

P.C. Number: 19-001

Project Name: Planned Unit Development – Arlington 425

Project Location: Block 425

Planning Department Contact: Sam Hubbard, Planning and Community Development

General Comments:

The information provided is conceptual only and subject to a formal plan review.

1. All currently adopted codes shall apply including the 2000 Edition of the Life Safety Code, NFPA 101.
2. The entrance off of Highland Ave shows a width of 17 feet with additional width on either side using brick pavers. Brick pavers are not an approved surface for fire lanes.
3. Buildings or portions of buildings or facilities exceeding 30 feet in height above the lowest level of fire department vehicle access shall be provided with approved fire apparatus access roads capable of accommodating fire department aerial apparatus. Overhead utility and power lines shall not be located within the aerial fire apparatus access roadway.
4. Aerial fire apparatus access roads shall have a minimum unobstructed width of 26 feet exclusive of shoulders, in the immediate vicinity of any building or portion of building more than 30 feet in height.
5. At least one of the required access routes for aerial fire apparatus shall be located within a minimum of 15 feet and a maximum of 30 feet from the building, and shall be positioned parallel to one entire side of the building.
6. The truck auto-turn drawing shows fire apparatus entering the complex from S. Highland Ave and while turning the front end is extending beyond the roadway over the parkway. No obstructions should be permitted in this area.
7. The truck auto-turn shows fire apparatus traveling through the complex and exiting on to Campbell Street and in the process traveling under the building connection. It is not clear if fire apparatus would clear the height of the portion over the roadway.
8. There is no auto-turn drawing showing fire apparatus accessing the area of the "courtyard" for accessing the exposure of the west side of the 44 S. Highland building.
9. The main fire lane to circle is made of brick pavers. Brick pavers is not an allowable surface for fire lanes.
10. The "reinforced lawn" area is using brick pavers which is not allowable. In addition, drawings show that there are structures and other obstructions in this area that would prevent fire apparatus from traversing the entire length of the building as required.

11. Fire apparatus access roads shall extend to within 150 feet of all portions of buildings and all portions of the exterior walls of the first story of buildings as measured by an approved route around the exterior of each building.
12. Fire apparatus access roads (non-aerial operations) shall have an unobstructed width of not less than 20 feet, exclusive of shoulders.
13. Fire apparatus access roads shall be designed and maintained to support the imposed loads of fire apparatus and shall be surfaced so as to provide all weather driving capabilities.
14. New buildings four or more stories above grade plane, except those with a roof slope greater than four units vertical in 12 units horizontal, shall be provided with a stairway to the roof. Stairway access to the roof shall be in accordance with Section 1009.12. Such stairways shall be marked at street and floor levels with a sign indicating that the stairway continues to the roof. Where roofs are used for roof gardens or for other purposes, stairways shall be provided as required for such occupancy classification.
15. Where required and in **all buildings classified as high-rise** buildings by the International Building Code, a fire command center for fire department operations shall be provided.
16. The location and accessibility of the fire command center shall be located on the first floor and approved by the fire chief. The fire command center shall be separated from the remainder of the building by not less than a 1 hour fire barrier or horizontal assembly or both.
17. The fire command center shall be a minimum of 200 square feet in area with a minimum dimension of 10 feet. A layout of the fire command center and all features required by this section to be contained therein shall be submitted for approval prior to installation.
18. The fire command center shall comply with NFPA 72 and shall contain the following features:
 - a. The emergency voice/alarm communication system control unit.
 - b. The fire department communications system.
 - c. Fire detection and alarm system annunciator.
 - d. Annunciator unit visually indicating the location of the elevators and whether they are operational.
 - e. Status indicators and controls for air distribution systems.
 - f. The fire-fighter's control panel required by Section 909.16 for smoke control systems installed in the building.
 - g. Controls for unlocking stairway doors simultaneously.
 - h. Sprinkler valve and water-flow detector display panels.
 - i. Emergency and standby power status indicators.
 - j. A telephone for fire department use with controlled access to the public telephone system.
 - k. Fire pump status indicators.
 - l. Schematic building plans indicating the typical floor plan and detailing the building core, means of egress, fire protection systems, fire-fighting equipment and fire department access, and the location of fire walls, fire barriers, fire partitions, smoke barriers and smoke partitions.
 - m. Work table.

- n. Generator supervision devices, manual start and transfer features.
 - o. Public address system, where specifically required.
 - p. Elevator fire recall switch in accordance with ASME A17.1.
 - q. Elevator emergency or standby power selector switch (es), where emergency or standby power is provided.
- 19. Buildings shall have approved radio coverage for emergency responders within the building based upon the existing coverage levels of the public safety communication systems of the jurisdiction at the exterior of the building.
 - 20. Emergency and standby power systems shall be provided where required per the International Fire Code and International Building Code.
 - 21. Fire department connections shall be located on the street side of buildings, fully visible and located at the main front entrance of the building and within a maximum travel distance of 100 feet to the nearest fire hydrant and in accordance with the NFPA standard applicable to the system design. The location of fire department connections shall be approved.
 - 22. Sprinkler access/equipment room should be located on the first floor.
 - 23. A complete NFPA compliant fire suppression system is required. Supervised indicating control valves shall be provided at the point of connection to the riser on each floor.
 - 24. An approved water supply capable of supplying the required fire flow for fire protection shall be provided.
 - 25. Fire protection equipment and service rooms shall be identified in an approved manner.
 - 26. Approved access shall be provided and maintained for all fire protection equipment to permit immediate safe operation and maintenance of such equipment.
 - 27. In buildings and structures where standby power is required or furnished to operate an elevator the operation shall comply with current code requirements.
 - 28. A fully functional fire alarm with zoning indicator capabilities shall be installed per NFPA 72. The alarm annunciator panel shall be located at the front entrance.
 - 29. Shop drawings for fire alarm systems shall be submitted for review and approval prior to system installation.
 - 30. Visible alarm notification appliances shall be provided in public areas and common areas. A visible exterior weatherproof alarm notification device shall be located within closest proximity to the front main entrance of the building or tenant space.
 - 31. A key box (Know Box) shall be provided and contain keys to gain necessary access as required by the fire code official.

32. Fire pumps, if provided, shall be installed in accordance with the Fire Code and NFPA 20 and shall comply with all current code requirements including a minimum of two water mains located in different streets.
33. Exit signs shall be illuminated at all times and have emergency power backup.
34. In order to be considered part of an accessible means of egress, an elevator shall comply with the emergency operation and signaling device requirements.
35. In buildings where a required accessible floor is four or more stories above or below a level of exit discharge, at least one required accessible means of egress shall be an elevator with some exceptions.
36. In buildings four or more stories above grade plane, one stairway shall extend to the roof surface, unless the roof has a slope steeper than four units vertical in 12 units horizontal.
37. Buildings shall have approved address numbers.
38. Signs shall be posted on both sides of an approach of any fire lane stating “NO PARKING – FIRE LANE”. Signs shall have arrows indicating the area of parking restriction.
39. Fire lane signs shall be white with red three-inch letters. The dimensions of the sign shall be 12 inches horizontally and 18 inches vertically. These signs shall be installed so that the top of the sign is no less than 6 feet nor more than 6 feet above grade.
40. All new elevators shall be equipped with emergency key opening devices at all landings. The location and specific type of device shall be approved by the Fire Department.
41. If the elevator uses an automatic dialer, the ten digit number 847-590-3470 shall be used. If bidirectional communication is available and is used, the elevator should call 911. The phone line used to dial 911 must have the correct address information affiliated with that phone line.
42. **Emergency Signs required for elevators** shall be 7 inches by 5 inches and read as follows: IN FIRE EMERGENCY, DO NOT USE ELEVATOR. USE EXIT STAIRS.
43. At least one elevator shall be provided for fire department emergency access to all floors. The elevator car shall be of such a size and arrangement to accommodate an ambulance stretcher in its horizontal, open position, provided the cab size shall be not less than 60 inches by 85 inches, to accommodate an ambulance stretcher in its horizontal, open position; and shall be identified by the International Symbol for emergency medical services (Star of Life). The Symbol shall be not less than 3 inches high and shall be placed inside on both sides of the hoist-way door frame.

Date 01-24-19

Reviewed By: 
Fire Safety Supervisor

Memorandum

To: Sam Hubbard, Planning & Community Development
From: Cris Papierniak, Assistant Director of Public Works
Date: February 6, 2019
Subject: Arlington 425, PC#19-001

With regard to the rezoning PUD, preliminary plat for Arlington 425, I have the following comments:

- 1) It appears that 225 S. Campbell will be supplied by water and serviced by sewer in one location, verify this is the case.
- 2) The 4" water service on the west side of Highland is actually a 6" line and assumed to be abandoned.
- 3) The proposed hydrant relocation on the north side of the existing parking garage (Highland) must be relocated further from the parking garage (perhaps north of entry apron).
- 4) The watermain on Chestnut is assumed to be a 6" watermain.
- 5) Submit details for the underground detention basin and restricted outfall.
- 6) Submit a maintenance plan for the underground detention basin and restricted outfall.
- 7) The Village has an underground conduit for fiber optic and copper cable (communications). It is located within the east parkway of Chestnut between the sidewalk and curb. This must be reflected in the survey.
- 8) The connection to the existing (abandoned) combined/storm sewer must verify or complete the proper abandonment/plugging to the north.
- 9) The Village needs structural review and field verification of the existing Vail Garage footings to be included in design of Highland Building.
- 10) The Village needs plans and structural approval of all modifications needed to existing garage. It appears that changes are needed to accommodate the loading bays and south entrance onto Highland.
- 11) All downspouts need to tie into proposed detention basin to reduce surcharge experienced during extreme rain events.

Arlington Heights Public Works will make further comments after construction plans have been submitted.

PETITIONER'S APPLICATION - ARLINGTON HEIGHTS PLAN COMMISSION

Petition #: P.C. 19-001
 Petitioner: CCH LLC
838 Busse Highway
Park Ridge, Illinois 60068
 Owner: CCH LLC
838 Busse Rd, Park Ridge, IL 60068
Attn: Bruce Adreani
 Contact Person: Michael D. Firsell of Firsell Ross
 Address: 2801 Lakeside Dr., Suite 207
Bannockburn, IL 60015
 Phone #: (847) 582-9910
 Fax #: (847) 307-7970
mffirsell@firsellross.com

P.I.N.# 13 PINs
 Location: Block 425 of the Master Plan
 Rezoning: ✓ Current: B5 & R3 Proposed: B5
 Subdivision: ✓
 # of Lots: ✓ Current: 17 Proposed: 1
 PUD: ✓ For: 361-unit mixed use
 Special Use: ✓ For: apartments in B-5
 Land Use Variation: ✓ For: Ch 28, § 5.1-14.1
and 14.6 for dwellings on 1st floor, 2 setback variations
 Land Use: ✓ Current: vacant
 Proposed: mixed-use
 Site Gross Area: 124,964 square feet
 # of Units Total: 361 (65 Stu; 197 1-bdr, 99 2-bdr)
 1BR: 2BR: 3BR: 4BR:

(Petitioner: Please do not write below this line.)

1. PUBLIC IMPROVEMENTS

REQUIRED: YES NO COMMENTS

a. Underground Utilities

Water NO

Sanitary Sewer

NO

Storm Sewer NO

b. Surface Improvement

Pavement YES (CHESTNUT PARKING)

Curb & Gutter YES

Sidewalks YES

Street Lighting YES

c. Easements

Utility & Drainage NO

Access NO

2. PERMITS REQUIRED OTHER THAN VILLAGE:

a. MWRDGC

X

b. IDOT

c. ARMY CORP

d. IEPA

e. CCHD

YES

YES

NO

X

COMMENTS

3. R.O.W. DEDICATIONS?

4. SITE PLAN ACCEPTABLE?

X

5. PRELIMINARY PLAT ACCEPTABLE?

X

6. TRAFFIC STUDY ACCEPTABLE?

SEE TDM'S COMMENTS

7. STORM WATER DETENTION REQUIRED?

YES

8. CONTRIBUTION ORDINANCE EXISTING?

YES

NO

9. FLOOD PLAIN OR FLOODWAY EXISTING? ...

YES

NO

500 YEAR FLOOD

10. WETLAND EXISTING?

NO

GENERAL COMMENTS ATTACHED

PLANS PREPARED BY: SPACE W & KLDA
 DATE OF PLANS: 1/16/19

Michael J. Firsell
 Director
 Village Engineer

2/1/19
 Date

PLAN COMMISSION PC #19-001
Arlington 425
PUD, Preliminary Plat of Subdivision, Rezoning from R-1 to B-5,
LUV for Apartment Building, Variations
Round 1

11. The petitioner is notified that these comments are being provided to ensure that the project meets the requirements for submittal to the Plan Commission. Approval by the Plan Commission is not an endorsement or approval of these documents to obtain the required building permits, engineering approval, or permits required by other government or permitting agencies for construction. Detailed plan review with associated comments will be provided upon submittal of plans for a building permit. The petitioner shall acknowledge that they accept this understanding.
12. Since a subdivision is being proposed, the plans must meet all subdivision requirements. Final engineering plans for all public improvements must be approved prior to the final plat of subdivision approval. An Engineers estimate of construction cost for full site improvements is required to complete the calculation for plan review, inspection, and other fees. An Engineers estimate of construction cost for public improvements is also required to complete the calculation for the required public improvement guarantee deposit. The public improvements for this development would be sidewalk, curb and gutter, widening of Chestnut Ave for parking, and street lighting. These estimates should be submitted at least three weeks prior to the final Plan Commission meeting to allow us time to generate the fee letter and for the petitioner to assemble the proper documents.
13. Final engineering plans shall be georeferenced by using State Plane Coordinate System – Illinois East. Below are details about projection:

Projected Coordinate System:	NAD_1983_StatePlane_Illinois_East_FIPS_1201_Feet
Projection:	Transverse_Mercator
False_Easting:	984250.00000000
False_Northing:	0.00000000
Central_Meridian:	-88.33333333
Scale_Factor:	0.99997500
Latitude_Of_Origin:	36.66666667
Linear Unit:	Foot_US
Geographic Coordinate System:	GCS_North_American_1983
Datum:	D_North_American_1983
Prime Meridian:	Greenwich
Angular Unit:	Degree

14. The Final Plat of Subdivision must be reviewed and approved by Engineering prior to final Plan Commission approval. The original signed mylar Final Plat of Subdivision, containing all non-Village signatures, shall be submitted one week before the scheduled date of the final Plan Commission meeting. Village Code Section 29-209 also requires a digital copy of the plat to be provided on disk to the Village. The petitioner shall acknowledge that they accept this understanding.
15. The proposed detention/retention facility will be a private system and as such will not be the Village's responsibility to maintain. An Onsite Utility Maintenance Agreement must be executed prior to final engineering approval. Please contact the Village Engineer for an editable version of the OUMA.
16. The preliminary detention calculations are acceptable. Final approval will require final engineering plans including calculations for storage provided and details of the detention system. The detention storage system located under pavement must be designed to AASHTO HS-25 loading standard. Restrictors between 2" and

4" must be in a trap in a catch basin. Regarding the hood, for reference is a removal hood detail from the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District. Provide a detail showing the restrictor catch basin.

17. Provide a site photometric lighting diagram indicating lighting intensities. Also provide the associated catalog cuts for all roadway, parking lot, and building mounted luminaires. All fixtures must be flat bottom, sharp cut-off, and no wall pack style fixtures will be permitted.
18. The fire truck maneuver exhibits provided only show fire truck access to the Campbell St building. Provide the necessary exhibits to show how the Chestnut Ave and Highland Ave buildings will be accessed. Verify that the parcel carrier location shown on the architectural site plan does not affect the access to the fire lane shown between the Chestnut Ave and Highland Ave buildings.
19. The existing conditions survey is from the year 2002 and does not show the existing Vail Garage structure over Highland Avenue. Other surface and/or underground improvements have been made in the interim. The existing conditions must be checked and updated to enable cogent comments.
20. Provide additional information to show the clearance of all trucks for the access off Campbell St, under the Campbell St building.
21. The maneuvers provided for all trucks (single unit, garbage and fire truck) appear to be problematic for the Campbell St entrance, the drop off area on the north side of the Chestnut Ave building, and the drop off area on the north side of the Highland Ave building. In the event vehicles are parked in the drop off area, the trucks will not be able to complete the turn. Snow removal operations must take into consideration maintaining the space needed for all vehicles to maneuver.
22. Fire lanes adjacent to buildings must have a minimum pavement width as directed by the Fire Department to accommodate the tower truck's outriggers. Fire lanes require a heavy duty pavement section. Asphalt pavement section to consist of: 2" Surface, 2-1/4" N-50 Binder, 5" N-50 Binder, and 4" CA-6 Stone Subbase. Concrete driveway apron to be 8" thick. The proposed permeable pavers, brick pavers and reinforced lawn located in the fire lane must be designed with a cross section that meets or exceeds the structural number of the Village's heavy duty pavement section specified. The heavy duty pavement section must also be shown on the fire truck maneuver exhibits. Provide a cross section for the underground parking and reinforced lawn (fire lane).
23. The fire lane between the Chestnut Ave and Highland Ave buildings is show as "reinforced lawn". Fire lanes require a hard surface and must be plowed for year-round access.
24. Coordinate possible fire lane cross access with the parcel located south of the proposed development.
25. The setback for the Chestnut Ave building is shown from the existing right-of-way. Provide the setback to the proposed right-of-way.
26. The setback shown on the south side of the Highland Ave building is 12.4 ft. The information presented to the Village Board references a requested variance of 12.9 ft. for the Highland Ave building. Clarify this setback.
27. The public sidewalk across all access points must meet the Public Right-of-Way Accessibility Guidelines, including 2% maximum cross slope. In the event there will be a stop sign or yield sign at a driveway, detectable warning panels will be required. The island at the Campbell St access is within the pedestrian access route and should be revised to provide clear access across the entire access. Sidewalks take precedence through driveways. Driveway curb returns shall not go through sidewalks. Additional grades and details will be necessary at final engineering.

28. The plans do not accurately shown the existing conditions near the intersection of Campbell St and Chestnut Ave, including the current striping, crosswalk, and ADA ramp at the SE corner of Campbell St and Chestnut Ave. Revise the plans accordingly.
29. The access to the underground parking for the Chestnut Ave building is shown at 10%, which may present issues during inclement weather such as snow or ice. The petitioner may want to consider providing a heating element.
30. The preliminary grading plan shows a retaining wall along the entire south property line, ranging in height from ½ ft. to 4 ½ ft. Revise the grading and proposed elevations accordingly such that the retaining wall will not be necessary. The wall around the Chestnut Ave access to the underground parking garage is acceptable.
31. The proposed sanitary sewer service for the Highland Ave building is less than 10 ft. from the proposed water service. This can be addressed at final engineering.
32. The proposed sanitary sewer service for the Campbell St building crosses the existing 10" water main along Campbell St and may be in conflict. Verify the depth of the existing water main and show additional information for this and all crossings. This can be addressed at final engineering.
33. The submittal references that the project will be constructed in two phases, with the Chestnut Ave and underground parking garage being constructed as the second phase. Additional information should be provided to show the limits of the two phases, the limits of the underground garage to be constructed in the first phase, and verify that the fire access will not be affected during construction of Phase II.
34. Provide preliminary information on how the utilities will be provided to the buildings (Comed, Nicor, etc.) and how any existing utilities will be addressed.

Preliminary Plat of Subdivision:

35. The Subdivision Code requires the dedication of eight feet of right-of-way along the west side of Highland Ave. The Village is still evaluating whether a variation to waive the dedication of the portion of the side along Highland Ave that abuts the Vail Ave garage is reasonable.
36. All building setback lines shall be shown on the plat.
37. For the Final Plat of Subdivision, use the attached Final Plat of Subdivision Checklist. The elementary school district is Consolidated Community School District #25, Township High School District #214, Harper Community College District #512.


Traffic:

38. Reconcile the differences between engineering and architect's plans regarding width and paving material of internal roadways, driveways, sidewalks, drop off/loading lanes, and on-street parking. Chestnut Building driveway must be 24 ft. width by code.
39. Provide driveway curb cut width of Campbell Street driveway. Curb returns for driveway and at intersections should be 25 ft. radius typical, 20 ft. min.
40. Include the Village standard detail for the streetscape cross section for paving brick, concrete ribbons, tree placement, etc.
41. The traffic report identifies the need to establish proper sight distance for driveways and street intersections. Provide exhibit showing required sight triangles. Modify on street parking accordingly.

42. All intersections at existing stops sign must comply with state law: No Parking 30 ft. in advance of and 20 ft. departing a stop sign; No Parking within 15 ft. of a fire hydrant.
43. Show pedestrian access from the proposed site to the existing Vail Garage at the north entrance at Highland Avenue. Since there is no pedestrian walkway on the west side of Highland underneath the Vail Garage, north-south pedestrian movement along Highland Avenue needs to be along the existing walk on the east side of the street underneath the garage.
44. The proximity of drop off lanes adjacent to the single inbound and outbound lanes of the proposed Campbell Street driveway poses possible conflicts with opening car doors, cars queuing to use this feature, cars double parking to unload passengers, and vehicle occupants moving across the lanes to get to the section of the building opposite from where they are being dropped off. Is there a center barrier between lanes to prevent crossing pedestrian movements? Provide comment on how to mitigate these concerns.
45. Show centerline striping on Highland Avenue south of Campbell Street to channelize traffic for the entrance to the Vail Garage.
46. Suggest protection of the side panels of the Vail Garage panels by placement of bollards or concrete Jersey wall type barriers adjacent to opening.
47. Southbound traffic from Campbell Street from under the Campbell building when entering the traffic circle needs pavement marking, arrows, and/or signage in the median showing the one-way counter-clockwise flow for the circle.
48. Since traffic from the Campbell Street driveway can access the Highland building parking garage entrance at the northwest corner of the building, only a right turn into the garage driveway is permitted. Signage or pavement markings to prohibit vehicles from continuing easterly needs to be provided.
49. The same informational striping, arrows, and/or signage needs to be provided for westbound traffic from Highland Avenue entering the traffic circle.
50. Traffic exiting this garage exit at the northwest corner of the Highland building can only turn left and proceed around the traffic circle. Provide pavement markings and/or signage prohibiting right turns out of the driveway.
51. Based on the traffic counts, this driveway is the predominate access point to the Highland building garage. Traffic turning in, coming from the east turning left into the garage, results in a lot of required turns and forced traffic flow in a very compressed area. Provide comment on how to mitigate these concerns.
52. The magnitude and impact of this project on adjacent roadways has the potential to be significant and cause surface and sub-surface damage. Final engineering plans should include pavement patching and resurfacing of the half streets adjacent to the development. The Village reserves the right to require street reconstruction should that be required based on actual damage. Current standards for streets with one sided parking is 32 ft. b-b of curb, (for Chestnut Avenue) and two sided parking cross section is 43 ft. b-b of curb, (for Highland Avenue).
53. The existing truck loading operations on the east side of Highland Avenue often congest traffic along the street. When trucks occupy the loading bay, other trucks staging do not have a clear area while waiting. Introduction of two more loading docks within 50 ft. south of this area would suggest freight clutter staging along Highland Avenue. Provide anticipated truck delivery operations, scheduling, and number of trucks that would be necessary to service these buildings. Additionally, the location where this is shown requires modification to the Vail Garage structure to remove the existing concrete skirt panels that are only 8-9 ft. above grade, limiting vertical clearance.

54. Will the existing Vail Garage require shoring or steel sheeting to retain footing integrity once excavation for the Highland Building commences?
55. At Chestnut Avenue, and also necessary at the Highland Avenue intersections with Campbell Street, the existing overhead high mast lighting must be provided to provide required street intersection illumination.
56. Where on the property will bicycle parking be provided?
57. As part of the final plans, a preliminary construction management schedule, maintenance of traffic plan, identification of potential utilization of Village streets for construction staging, public sidewalk closures, areas for materials storage, and requested detour routing, must be provided. The finalized construction schedule, maintenance of traffic, and construction staging plan must be submitted by the contractor as part of the building permit.
58. Traffic Report Figure 3, is incorrect for the all way stop signage shown at Wing St. and Vail Ave.
59. Traffic Report Figure 4 must be corrected for 'Inset B', which shows three intersecting driveways along the north side of the street. However, the text on page 8 refers to four driveways.
60. Traffic Report Table 1 Accident Data, I.D.O.T summary seems to underrepresent the accident experience based upon the retrieval of AHPD accidents at the Highland and Campbell intersection. Accident reports for the four intersections adjacent to the site must be retrieved from the Police Department for analysis.
61. Traffic Report page 13, has a typo for access to the Highland Building from Chestnut Avenue. In addition, the discussion suggesting loading operations along the widened section of Chestnut Avenue is not supported.
62. Traffic Report page 14, explains the number of internal drop off/loading areas, but provide evaluation of the competition for use of the areas between pedestrians and delivery vehicles.
63. Evaluate the motorists' sight distance exiting the driveway from the Highland Building under the Vail Garage.
64. Traffic Report page 17, needs to provide some discussion to explain the use of ITE land use code 220, rather than utilizing codes 221, 222, or 223 as more representative of these buildings. Please provide calculations and pages cited from the ITE 10th edition. Also provide the Retail, Restaurant, and Office generation rates.
65. Traffic Report page 19, Figure 7: It is confusing why southbound traffic on Chestnut from Campbell Street generates 22, (23) vehicles S.B. that seem to bypass the site.
66. Traffic Report page 19, Figure 7: Similarly, for southbound Highland traffic from Campbell Street, 34, (45) S.B. trips bypass the garage driveway into the Highland Building seemingly not entering or exiting the site.
67. Traffic Report page 19, Figure 7: Internal trip generation values from the Highland Building northwest corner driveway should be provided since this seem like the higher volume generator from that building.
68. Traffic Report page 19, Figure 7: There are arithmetic errors on the exhibit that do not equal the values shown in Table 2.
69. Traffic Report page 21: There are numerous errors for the summation of values of Figures 7 & 8 suggested as the final projected counts for the intersections of Ridge, Chestnut, and Highland with Campbell Street, as well as the intersections of Chestnut and Highland with Sigwalt Street. Revise and correct these counts and rerun the Synchro analysis to verify the accuracy of the LOS values as required.
70. The report did not discuss weekend or nighttime traffic count or parking data when the other business have their peak hour of the generator.

71. Traffic Report page 28: As suggested above, provisions for pedestrian crosswalks are needed at the intersection of Highland and Campbell.
72. See comment #19. The Traffic Report must be updated based on the actual conditions of Highland Avenue under the Vail Garage. Provide a LOS for the intersections of Highland Avenue and the two garage ramps.
73. Traffic Report page 32: The description of the Chestnut Avenue passenger/loading zones infers proprietary use of the on-street loading zone for this site's residents. However the discussion on the next page about the number of onsite passenger/loading areas make on street loading zones unnecessary. Village policy and enforcement will not support on street loading zones.
74. Traffic Report page 36 &37: Provide ITE backup and calculations to support the findings in tables 7 & 8.


Michael L. Pagones, P.E. 2/1/19
Village Engineer Date

Attachments:

- Final Plat of Subdivision Checklist (3 pages)
- Contacts for Plat Signatures (1 page)
- Sample Utility Signature Blocks (1 page)
- Removal Hood Detail from the MWRD (1 page)

Final Plat of Subdivision Checklist
Municipal Code Section 29-209(a - t)

- ☐ a. The date of preparation of the final plat and by whom prepared.
- ☐ b. The boundary of the plat, based on accurate traverse, with angles and lineal dimensions.
- ☐ c. All permanent survey monuments, markers and bench marks.
- ☐ d. Exact location, width and name of all streets within and adjoining the plat, and the exact location and widths of all cross walkways.
- ☐ e. True angles and distances to the nearest established street lines or official monuments, not less than three.
- ☐ f. Municipal, township, county and section lines accurately tied to the lines of the subdivision by distances and angles.
- ☐ g. Radii, internal angles, points and curvatures, tangent bearings and lengths of all arcs.
- ☐ h. All easements for rights of way established for public use and utilities.
- ☐ i. All lot numbers and lines, with accurate dimensions given in hundredths of feet.
- ☐ j. Accurate outlines and legal descriptions of all areas dedicated or reserved for public use, with the proposed uses indicated thereon; and all areas to be reserved by deed covenant for the common use of all property owners; together with the proposed uses indicated thereon.
- ☐ k. The text of protective covenants, approved by the Plan Commission, relating to the proposed subdivision.
- ☐ l. An endorsement by the County Clerk in the form acceptable to Cook County, that there are no delinquent, forfeited, foreclosed or purchased general taxes, or unpaid current general taxes, against the land proposed to be subdivided.
- ☐ m. A summary of all restrictions applicable to any part of such subdivision concerning building restrictions, use restrictions, building setback lines and similar matters.
- ☐ n. A deed of dedication in the form set forth in Section 29-217(a):
The Final plat shall contain a deed of dedication substantially as follows:

"We, the undersigned, (Names), owners of the real estate shown and described herein, do hereby lay off, plat and subdivide said real estate in accordance with the within plat. This subdivision shall be known and designated as (Name), an addition to the Village of Arlington Heights, Cook County. All streets and alleys and public open spaces shown and not heretofore dedicated are hereby dedicated to the public. Front and side yard building setback lines are established as shown on this plat, between which lines and the property lines of the streets, there shall be erected or maintained no building or structure. There are strips of ground, (Number) feet in width, as shown on this plat and marked 'Easement' reserved for the use of public utilities for the installation of water and sewer mains, poles, ducts, lines and wires, subject at all times to the proper authorities and to the easement herein reserved. No permanent or other structures are to be erected or maintained upon

these strips of land, but owners of lots in this subdivision shall take their titles subject to the rights of the public utilities, and to the rights of the owners of other lots in this subdivision.

(Additional dedications and protective covenants, or private restrictions, would be inserted here upon the subdivider's initiative or the recommendation of the Plan Commission or Village Board; important provisions are those specifying the use to be made of the property and, in the case of residential use, the minimum habitable floor area.)

The foregoing covenants (or restrictions), are to run with the land and shall be binding on all parties and all persons claiming under them until January 1, 20____ [25 year period is suggested], at which time said covenants (or restrictions) shall be automatically extended for successive periods of ten years unless indicated otherwise by negative vote of a majority of the then owners of the building sites covered by these covenants (or restrictions), in whole or in part, which said vote will be evidenced by a petition in writing signed by the owners and duly recorded. Invalidation of any one of the foregoing covenants (or restrictions) by judgment or court order shall in no way affect any of the other various covenants (or restrictions), which shall remain in full force and effect.

The right to enforce these provisions by injunction, together with the right to cause the removal, by due process of law, of any structure or part thereof erected or maintained in violation, is hereby dedicated to the public, and reserved to the several owners of the several lots in this subdivision and to their heirs and assigns.

WITNESS our hands and seals this ____ day of _____, 20____.

STATE OF ILLINOIS)
COUNTY OF COOK) SS.

Before me the undersigned Notary Public, in and for the County and State aforesaid, personally appeared (Names), and each separately and severally acknowledged the execution of the foregoing instrument as his or her voluntary act and deed, for the purposes therein expressed.

WITNESS my hand and notarial seal this ____ day of 20 ____.

Notary Public"

- ☐ o. A blank certificate of approval in the form set forth in Section 29-217(b).
The Final plat shall contain a certificate of approval as follows:

"Under the authority provided by 65 ILCS 5/11-12 as amended by the State Legislature of the State of Illinois and Ordinance adopted by the Village Board of the Village of Arlington Heights, Illinois, this plat was given approval by the Village of Arlington Heights AND MUST BE RECORDED WITHIN SIX MONTHS OF THE DATE OF APPROVAL BY THE VILLAGE BOARD, OTHERWISE IT IS NULL AND VOID.

APPROVED by the Plan Commission at a meeting held _____

Chairman

Secretary

APPROVED by the Village Board of Trustees at a meeting held _____

President

Village Clerk

APPROVED by the Village Collector

APPROVED by the Village Engineer

”

- ☐ p. A certification by a registered surveyor in the form set forth in Section 29-217(c). The Final plat shall contain a certificate signed by an Illinois Registered Land Surveyor in substantially the following form:

“I, (Name), hereby certify that I am an Illinois Registered Land Surveyor in compliance with the laws of the State of Illinois, and that this plat correctly represents a survey completed by me on (Date); that all monuments and markers shown thereon actually exist, and that I have accurately shown the materials that they are made of.

Signature

(SURVEYOR'S SEAL)

Illinois Land Surveyor
No. _____”

- ☐ q. A notarized statement from the owner indicating the school district in which each tract, parcel, lot or block lies.
- ☐ r. A certificate in the form as required by the Illinois Department of Transportation or Cook County Highway Department, respectively, when any new street or new driveway will access one of these Department's streets.
- ☐ s. The parcel index numbers of all lots contained within the plat shall be included on the plat of subdivision.
- ☐ t. A block stating "Send Tax Bill To: (Name/Address)." The actual name and address shall be provided by the developer.
- ☐ u. Provide a location to identify the address of each new lot.

The Village of Arlington Heights Municipal Code can be accessed over the internet at www.vah.com .

Contacts for Plat Signatures

Mr. Frank Gautier Comcast Cable 688 Industrial Drive Elmhurst, IL 60126	224-229-5853 Frank_Gautier2@comcast.com Alternates: Bob Schulter (Department Supervisor), Martha Agieras (Assistant) Bob_Schulter@comcast.ncom Martha_Gieras@comcast.com <i>Per Frank: Request that completed plat data be shared with Comcast in advance of signature, and that the plat be physically provided at their 688 Industrial Drive office at a mutually agreed date and time.</i>
---	---

Mr. Mark Cozzi ComEd Three Lincoln Center, 4th Floor Oakbrook Terrace, IL 60181	630-576-6530 Mark.Cozzi@ComEd.com
---	--

Ms. Kim Augustine NICOR Gas 300 W Terra Cotta Ave Crystal Lake, IL 60014	630-338-2976 kaugust@aglresources.com
--	--

Ms. Sue E. Manshum ROW Engineer Ameritech 1391 Abbot Ct Buffalo Grove, IL 60089	847-465-6086 sm9231@att.com
--	--

Mr. Dominick Silvio WOW Internet Cable 4350 Weaver Parkway Warrenville, IL 60555	630-536-3121 dominick.silvio@wowinc.com
--	--

Ms. Abigail Robinson IDOT Permits 201 W Center Court Schaumburg, IL 60196	847-705-4541 Abigail.L.Robinson@illinois.gov
---	--

Mr. Michael Sterr, P.E. Permit Division Head, Construction Bureau Cook County Department of Transportation and Highways 69 W Washington St 24th Floor Chicago, IL 60602	312-603-1670 michael.sterr@cookcountyil.gov hwy.permits@cookcountyil.gov
---	--

Sample Signature Blocks

COMMONWEALTH EDISON COMPANY
EASEMENT APPROVED AND ACCEPTED

BY: _____ DATE: _____, 20__

TITLE: _____

AMERITECH/SBC
EASEMENT APPROVED AND ACCEPTED

BY: _____ DATE: _____, 20__

TITLE: _____

NICOR GAS
EASEMENT APPROVED AND ACCEPTED

BY: _____ DATE: _____, 20__

TITLE: _____

COMCAST CABLE
EASEMENT APPROVED AND ACCEPTED


BY: _____ DATE: _____, 20__

TITLE: _____


WIDE OPEN WEST, LLC
EASEMENT APPROVED AND ACCEPTED

BY: _____ DATE: _____, 20__


TITLE: _____




CATCH BASIN WITH OPTIONAL HOOD




REMOVABLE SNOOT OIL-WATER-DEBRIS
SEPARATOR (OPTIONAL)



OUTLET PIPE



DETAIL A



DETAIL B

NOTES:

1. ALL HOODS SHALL BE CONSTRUCTED OF A FIBERGLASS REINFORCED RESIN COMPOSITE WITH ISO GEL COAT EXTERIOR FINISH WITH A MINIMUM 0.125" LAMINATE THICKNESS.
2. ALL HOODS SHALL BE EQUIPPED WITH A WATERTIGHT ACCESS PORT, A MOUNTING FLANGE, AND AN ANTI-SIPHON VENT PIPE AND ELBOW AS DRAWN. (SEE CONFIGURATION DETAIL).
3. THE SIZE AND POSITION OF THE HOOD SHALL BE DETERMINED BY OUTLET PIPE SIZE AS PER MANUFACTURER'S RECOMMENDATION (SNOOT SIZE ALWAYS LARGER THAN PIPE SIZE).
4. THE BOTTOM OF THE HOOD SHALL EXTEND DOWNWARD A MINIMUM DISTANCE EQUAL TO $\frac{1}{2}$ THE OUTLET PIPE DIAMETER WITH A MINIMUM DISTANCE OF 6" FOR PIPES < 12" I.D.
5. THE ANTI-SIPHON VENT SHALL EXTEND ABOVE HOOD BY MINIMUM OF 3" AND A MAXIMUM OF 12" ACCORDING TO STRUCTURE CONFIGURATION.
6. THE SURFACE OF THE STRUCTURE WHERE THE HOOD IS MOUNTED SHALL BE FINISHED SMOOTH AND FREE OF LOOSE MATERIAL AND PIPE SHALL BE FINISHED FLUSH TO WALL.
7. THE REMOVABLE HOOD SHALL BE ATTACHED TO THE STRUCTURE WITH THE SLOTTED TABS MOUNTED OVER $\frac{3}{8}$ " STAINLESS STEEL BOLTS AND OIL-RESISTANT GASKETS.
8. POSITION HOOD SUCH THAT BOTTOM FLANGE IS AT A DISTANCE OF $\frac{1}{2}$ " OUTLET PIPE DIAMETER (MIN.) BELOW THE PIPE INVERT. MINIMUM DISTANCE FOR PIPES < 12" I.D. IS 6".
9. RESTRICTOR AND SNOOT WHEN PAIRED SHOULD BE INSTALLED IN SUCH A WAY THAT RESTRICTOR AND SNOOT REMAIN INSPECTABLE.
10. RESTRICTOR AND SNOOT HOOD SHALL BE CURVED TO INSIDE RADIUS OF STRUCTURE AND WATERTIGHT.

NOT TO SCALE



TECHNICAL GUIDANCE MANUAL

REMOVABLE HOOD basin and water
quality structure DETAIL

7/1/15

STD. DWG. NO.11

PAGE NO. 12



Arlington Heights Fire Department Plan Review Sheet

P. C. Number 19-001

Project Name Arlington 425

Project Location Campbell, Highland, and Chestnut

Planning Department Contact Sam Hubbard

General Comments

Round 1:

1. The buildings are to be fully sprinkled.
2. A Knox Box containing keys to access necessary parts of the building shall be at the main front entrance of the buildings and for each commercial/office space. The Fire Department will be requesting additional Knox Boxes for the buildings as plans get finalized due to the size and complexity of the project.
3. The Fire Department Connection shall be located at the main front entrance of the buildings, be fully visible, and accessible. It shall be located within a maximum travel distance of 100 feet to the nearest accessible fire hydrant capable of delivering the required fire flows. We also request an additional FDC be located at the southeast side of the "Highland Building" and the a fire hydrant be located in the circular drive area between the three buildings.
4. Install a fully operational annunciator panel or alarm panel at the main front entrance door of each building.

**NOTE: PLAN IS CONCEPTUAL ONLY
SUBJECT TO DETAILED PLAN REVIEW**

Date January 24, 2019 Reviewed By: LT. Mark Aleckson

ARLINGTON HEIGHTS POLICE DEPARTMENT

Community Services Bureau

DEPARTMENT PLAN REVIEW SUMMARY

Arlington 425
45 S. Chestnut Ave.

Round 1 Review Comments

02/01/2019

1. Character of use:

The character of use is consistent with the area. It will be necessary to limit access to the grounds, especially the pergola / firepit / courtyard- is this for residents only and does it have controlled access? This is recommended to limit access and loitering. The addition of Trespass signs is recommended.

2. Are lighting requirements adequate?

Lighting should be up to Village of Arlington Heights Code. Special attention should be given to those outside common areas- ie courtyard and parking garage. Landscaping must not create hiding locations and should provide for natural surveillance.

3. Present traffic problems?

There is not enough parking in the downtown area. Is the parking garage open to the public? If not, is there access control to restrict non-residents/non-permitted driver's access? Our Traffic Bureau has a number of concerns regarding parking enforcement, traffic patterns and other issues. The blue prints and Traffic Study have been forwarded by the Community Services Bureau to the Traffic Bureau for review.

4. Traffic accidents at particular location?

This is not a problem area in relation to traffic accidents.

5. Traffic problems that may be created by the development.

-The area around the vehicle entrance/exit should be clear of obstructions. Vehicle traffic entering and exiting the available covered parking must be able to view other vehicles and pedestrians. Street parking adjacent to the entrances/exits should be prohibited. Warning lights/audible signals could be used to signal that vehicles are exiting.

-Although the traffic study indicated no need for a stop sign at Highland and Sigwalt, the Police Department has concerns about the traffic flow at Highland and Sigwalt and the need of a four way stop sign at that intersection.

6. General comments:

- Is 225 W Campbell two separate buildings attached by a façade? If so this will create issues for emergency response for police and fire- the buildings should have different addresses

-Regarding the parking garage pedestrian bridge, who has access to this bridge? If it is not a resident only access we foresee issues with our homeless population seeking shelter in this area.

-Is the existing parking garage and the new parking garage both going to have public access to entrances off of Highland? If so, will the two parking garages have clearly marked addresses

delineating the two in the case of an emergency when a citizen is requesting assistance from 911?

-Is the new parking garage going to have public access or is it a resident only parking garage?

-Is the new parking garage designed in a way to reduce or eliminate members of our homeless population squatting there?

-Who owns the parking garage? Privately owned or Village Owned?

-Please ensure that there is an emergency information/contact card on file with the Arlington Heights Police Department and that it is up-to-date. Agent contact information must be provided to the Arlington Heights Police Department during all construction phases. The form is attached. Please complete and return. This allows police department personnel to contact an agent during emergency situations or for suspicious/criminal activity on the property during all hours.

-Parking could become an issue if a larger percentage of residents than expected have vehicles. Emergency telephones should be installed in the parking area for added safety.

-The storage area, lower level, should be secure and accessible only to residents. There should be signage to encourage users to lock their storage lockers and video surveillance of the area to deter theft and help identify potential offenders.

A. Ovington #330

Alexandra Ovington, Crime Prevention Officer
Community Services Bureau

D. Hajek #557

Doug Hajek, Sergeant
Community Services Bureau

Arlington Heights Police Department

Emergency Information Card

1. Fill in all information by tabbing to each field.
2. When completed, save the form and send as an attachment to: policemail@vah.com.

Arlington Heights Police Department
200 E. Sigwalt Street
Arlington Heights, IL 60005-1499
Phone: 847/368-5300

Completed forms may also be printed and submitted in the following manner:

By Mail: Arlington Heights Police Department
200 E. Sigwalt Street, Arlington Heights, IL 60005
Attention: Police Administration

Print Form (To Mail)

By Fax: (847) 368-5970 - Attention: Police Administration

In Person: Dropped off at the Arlington Heights Police Department's front desk for forwarding to Police Administration.

Name (Firm or Residence)

Address/City

Telephone Number

Date Information Obtained

IN CASE OF EMERGENCY PLEASE CALL:

Contact #1

Name

Address/City

Telephone Number

Cell Number

Contact #2

Name

Address/City

Telephone Number

Cell Number

Alarm System

☐ No

☐ Yes

Phone number:

Alarm Company Name

PETITIONER'S APPLICATION - ARLINGTON HEIGHTS PLAN COMMISSION

Petition #: P.C. 19-001
 Petitioner: CCH LLC
838 Busse Highway
Park Ridge, Illinois 60068
 Owner: CCH LLC
838 Busse Rd. Park Ridge, IL 60068
Attn: Bruce Adreani
 Contact Person: Michael D. Firsel of Firsel Ross
 Address: 2801 Lakeside Dr., Suite 207
Bannockburn, IL 60015
 Phone #: (847) 582-9910
 Fax #: (847) 307-7970
mfirsel@firselross.com

P.I.N.# 13 PINs
 Location: Block 425 of the Master Plan
 Rezoning: ✓ Current: B5 & R3 Proposed: B5
 Subdivision: ✓
 # of Lots: ✓ Current: 17 Proposed: 1
 PUD: ✓ For: 361-unit mixed use
 Special Use: ✓ For: apartments in B-5
 Land Use Variation: ✓ For: Ch 28, § 5.1-14.1
and 14.6 for dwellings on 1st floor, 2 setback variations
 Land Use: ✓ Current: vacant
 Proposed: mixed-use
 Site Gross Area: 124,964 square feet
 # of Units Total: 361 (65 Str; 197 1-bdr; 99 2-bdr)
 1BR: 2BR: 3BR: 4BR:

(Petitioner: Please do not write below this line.)

1. GENERAL COMMENTS:

See attached comments.


 Environmental Health Officer

1-31-19
 Date


 for
1/31/19 Direc
 Date

Plan Review for Accessibility

Addresses: Arlington 425
225 W. Campbell, 33 S. Chestnut, and 44 S. Highland

PUD, Preliminary Plat of Subdivision, Rezoning from R-1 to B-5, LUV for Apartment Building, Variations

P.C. #19-001 Round 1

Submitted to: Sam Hubbard, Planning & Community Development

Submitted by: David Robb, Disability Services Coordinator (847) 368-5793

Date: January 30, 2019 

Re: New Illinois Accessibility Code (IAC):
<https://www2.illinois.gov/cdb/announcements/2018/Pages/New-Illinois-Accessibility-Code.aspx>

Fair Housing Amendments Act, (42 U.S.C. §3601 et seq.)
<http://www.fairhousingfirst.org/fairhousing/requirements.html>

1. The requirements of IAC Section 233.6 Multi-story Housing apply.
2. All Common Use and Public Use Spaces on all floors (levels) shall be accessible in compliance with the applicable requirements of the Code per Section 233.6.1.
3. 20 percent of the dwelling units in each building shall be designed and constructed as either accessible or adaptable dwelling units and shall be distributed throughout each building to provide a variety of sizes and locations per IAC Section 233.6.4 in accordance with Section 812.
4. Petitioner shall supply a unit listing of 20% Accessible/Adaptable dwelling units for each building in a variety of sizes and locations as required by IAC Section 233.6.4.
5. An Accessible Route into and within all adaptable dwelling units to all rooms and spaces shall provide wheelchair maneuvering clearances at all doors as required by IAC Section 233.6.5.2 in accordance with Section 404.2.4.
6. An accessible route per IAC Section 233.6.5.3 shall be provided into and within all private patios, terraces, balconies and garages designated for use by adaptable dwelling units.

7. Entrance Doors to all individual dwelling units shall provide clear floor wheelchair maneuvering space in compliance with IAC Section 404.
8. Identify Areas of Refuge where persons unable to use stairways can remain temporarily to await instructions or assistance during emergency evacuation per IAC Section 506.6.

Sheet HL. 1 of 12 Ground Floor Parking Garage:

9. Identify the Circulation path from Accessible Parking spaces to the Elevator Lobby.

Sheet CA. 1 of 12 Second Floor Plan:

10. Bridge – Changes in level are not permitted in the required maneuvering clearances at doors per IAC Section 494.2.4.4 and shall comply with IAC Section 302.

Sheet CS - "Drop Off" locations:

11. Identify Passenger Loading Zones complying with IAC Section 503 for every continuous 100 linear feet of loading zone space, or fraction thereof with markings per IAC Section 209.2.1.
12. Identify the accessible route via curb ramp or other means adjoining the passenger loading zone with the sidewalk per IAC Section 503.3

Federal Fair Housing Accessibility Requirements:

13. **Important note:** In elevator buildings all public and common use areas and 100 percent of the dwelling units are covered by the Federal Fair Housing Accessibility Guidelines (See Fair Housing Amendments Act, 42 U.S.C. §3601 et seq.)

The ten "Safe Harbor" Equivalents detailing the 7-Requirements of Accessibility
<https://www.fairhousingfirst.org/faq/safeharbors.html>

- Requirement 1. Accessible building entrance on an accessible route.
- Requirement 2. Accessible and usable public and common use areas.
- Requirement 3. Usable doors.
- Requirement 4. Accessible route into and through the covered dwelling unit.
- Requirement 5. Light switches, electrical outlets, thermostats and other environmental controls in accessible locations.
- Requirement 6. Reinforced walls for grab bars.
- Requirement 7. Usable kitchens and bathrooms.



Planning & Community Development Dept. Review

January 30, 2019

REVIEW ROUND 1

Project: 3400 W. Euclid Ave.
Arlington Downs PUD Amendment

Case Number: PC 18-010

General:

7. The Plan Commission must review and approve the following actions:
 - a) Planned Unit Development to allow a 361 unit mixed use development.
 - b) Rezoning from the R-3, One-Family Dwelling District to the B-5, Downtown District, for four lots of the subject property.
 - c) Preliminary Plat of Subdivision to consolidate the subject property into one lot.
 - d) Land Use Variation to allow residential uses as a principal use in the B-5 District (Chestnut building).
 - e) Variation to Chapter 28, Section 5.1-14.4, Conditions of Use, to allow dwelling units below the second floor (Chestnut building).
 - f) Variation to Chapter 28, Section 5.1-14.2, Required Minimum Yards, to allow a 7' setback along a public street frontage (Chestnut Street) for the Campbell building where code requires a 20' setback.
 - g) Variation to Chapter 28, Section 5.1-14.2, Required Minimum Yards, to allow a 12.3' setback along a public street frontage (Chestnut Street) for the Chestnut building where code requires a 20' setback.
 - h) Variation to Chapter 28, Section 5.1-14.2, Required Minimum Yards, to allow a 12.4' setback along an interior lot line (southern lot line) for the Highland building where code requires a 25' setback.
 - i) Chapter 28, Section 10.2-7, Size, to allow a certain parking spaces within the Highland building garage to be 15' in depth where code requires 18' in depth.
 - j) A variation may be required for the proposed pergola.
 - k) Chapter 29, Section 29-304(l), to allow a 50' wide right-of-way for a local street where code requires a 66' wide right-of-way for local streets, along certain portions of Highland Avenue.
8. Please ensure that all plans and/or studies to be resubmitted as a result of the Round 1 Department review comments include a revision date. Additionally, all revised plans must incorporate any changes as recommended by the Design Commission.
9. Will any Bylaws or Covenants be established for the proposed development? Please provide these (in draft form) if so. How will shared parking and cross access be governed if individual buildings are taxed parceled off and sold to separate owners? Will easements be dedicated?
10. Impact Fee's will be required for the residential portion of the development, in accordance with Village Code.
11. Please revise the project narrative to provide information on any green features/sustainable design elements that are proposed (other than the green roofs).
12. A photometric plan is required.

13. Please note that all future restaurants will be required to receive a Special Use Permit or will be required to obtain a Special Use Permit Waiver, if eligible.
14. Based on communications with the Engineering Division and the Fire Safety Division, brick pavers are potentially viable for a fire lane, but must be supported by a structural engineer review that certifies the brick paver pavement design will meet the AASHTO HS-25 loading and also the punch through loading from the tower truck outriggers.
15. Section 9.8(i) of the Zoning Code requires that all PUD's include a preliminary construction schedule and phasing plan. Please provide the required preliminary construction schedule, which includes information on the approximate date of construction start, the number of construction phases and the starting and completion date for each phase, and details on what will be constructed in each phase, as well as a construction staging plan. The construction phasing plan shall include the anticipated number of construction workers and where they will park during each phase of construction, the type and amount of construction vehicles per phase and where they will be staged, the location of material storage, and information on anticipated lane closures, including info on where the closures will take place and the general timeframe for each closure. Please note that the project narrative includes a general description of the construction phases, with phase one involving the construction of the "Highland building, Campbell building, and infrastructure and common areas", and phase two involving the construction of the underground garage for the Chestnut building. Please clarify if construction of the common areas involves the courtyard landscaping, fire lane, and associated improvements within the courtyard area. If so, it is assumed that the construction of the underground garage for the Chestnut building will involve the removal of the previously constructed elements within the courtyard and will then involve their replacement. Please address this situation and confirm with the Fire Safety Division if temporary removal of the fire lane will be permitted.
16. Please provide a response to the criteria outlined in Section 9.5 of the Zoning code relative to variation approval standards for variations associated with a PUD.
17. Please be aware that the PUD will be reviewed in relation to the criteria contained in Section 9.10 of the Zoning code. An analysis demonstrating the economic benefits of this project shall be required.
18. For any new variations identified in these review comments, please provide a written response to the hardship criteria for variation approval, as outlined on page 2B of the zoning application and summarized below:
Variations and Land Use Variations:
 - The proposed use will not alter the essential character of the locality and will be compatible with existing uses and zoning of nearby property; and
 - The plight of the owner is due to unique circumstances, which may include the length of time the subject property has been vacant as zoned; and
 - The proposed variation is in harmony with the spirit and intent of this Chapter; and
 - The variance requested is the minimum variance necessary to allow reasonable use of the property.

Site Plan Related:

19. The site plan must be redesigned to accommodate for the fire lane concerns from the Fire Safety Division.
20. Please include the necessary zoning analysis on the site plans, as attached to the end of these review comments. All missing information within the tables must be filled out.
21. Please revise the site plan to accommodate for the potential future conversion of the one-way drive aisle from Highland Avenue to the internal courtyard to a two-way drive aisle (which would be added on the northern side

of this drive aisle and may need the screen wall of the loading area to be shifted slightly to the north).

22. The project narrative states that the southern setback of the Highland building will be 12.9', however, the engineering plans show a 12.4' setback. Please clarify and revise the plans accordingly.
23. Please provide an elevation of the proposed retaining wall along the southern property line, as well as details on the retaining wall (color, materials, etc.).
24. The ramp wall for the Chestnut garage appears to encroach on a visibility triangle. Please show all visibility triangles on the plans and propose a solution to the visibility issue for cars exiting the Chestnut garage ramp.
25. Please evaluate alternative locations for the loading zones within the Highland building that would allow the preservation of parking spaces along Highland and would not interfere with traffic along Highland. One option could be a loading zone along the drive aisle (similar to the loading zone along the west side of the 200 W. Campbell building). Or perhaps the loading zones in that building could be moved south to be combined with the drive aisle entrance/exit to the garage.
26. Please evaluate the on-street parking spaces on the east and west side of the porte-cochere entrance/exit of the Campbell building. The spaces on each side of the entrance/exit may not be viable to allow for suitable room and visibility for turns in/out of the porte-cochere.
27. Please revise the plans to provide details on the proposed fence along the southern property line and in front of the Chestnut building (height, style, materials, etc.).
28. Please revise the plans to include details on the proposed pergola at the southern end of the property. Additionally, please note that pergolas are considered accessory structures, and as such must be located in a rear yard only (i.e. completely behind the rear of the building). Pergolas are also restricted to 300 square feet in size, 15' in height, and must be setback 5' from a rear lot line. Please clarify if a variation is requested and provide the necessary written justification for any such variation.
29. Please revise the plans to provide additional details on the proposed fireplace at the rear of the property (setback, size, height, open fire pit? fireplace with chimney? outdoor grilling station?).
30. Please provide a detailed explanation of all utility relocations that will be necessary to facilitate this development, outlining which lines will be removed, what utilities are on those lines, and where those utilities will be re-routed. Will any new lines/poles or changes to existing lines/poles be needed to facilitate the utility removal? Will any upgrades to the utilities be required to accommodate for the proposed development? Please provide an update on all communications with utility companies regarding the ability of existing utilities in the area to accommodate for the proposed development and any upgrades that may be required.
31. As previously requested, please provide a separate exhibit that shows all building mounted, ground mounted, and interior utilities, switch gear, generators, meters, transformers, pedestals, and other mechanical equipment. For all exterior equipment, the exhibit should address how these items will be screened. The plans should also include preliminary information on expected locations/routing of gas lines, electric lines, cable lines, etc. It is understood that this plan will be conceptual and that final placements may need revisions as more detailed plans are developed.
32. Please provide details of any preliminary structural review of the Vail Avenue garage and the ability to construct the Highland building adjacent to the garage. Will any improvements to the garage be needed? Do the proposed access points to the Highland building (loading spaces, garage entrance/exit) conflict with any

structural elements of the garage?

Building Related:

33. Clarify if the rooftop restaurant is proposed at this time. The plans do not currently show this restaurant, however, the traffic and parking study has taken into account a restaurant within the amenity space. Will this restaurant be 2,500 sq. ft.? The plans should be revised to show this space if approval is being sought. A condition of approval may be recommended that would restrict the rooftop area from operating as a bar only (i.e. if liquor is to be served, the space would be required to have a full kitchen).
34. For each building, please provide a detailed explanation of how trash collection will function. Where will pick-up locations be? If collection will occur on the outside of a building, where will the dumpsters be stored on collection days? What time of day will trash collection likely occur? How many days a week will trash collection be needed?
35. For each building, please provide a detailed explanation outlining loading/drop-offs, deliveries (commercial and residential), and move-ins/move-outs. Where will each of these functions occur? Will there be any restrictions on times/days for such operations? Will there be an onsite doorman for residential deliveries?
36. Please provide a basement floorplan for the Highland building/garage and Campbell Building.
37. Please provide a breakdown of the square footage of each floor for each building (including basements).
38. Please provide a typical unit layout for each unit type.
39. Please dimension all parking stalls (width and depth) and provide drive aisle dimensions for both the Highland building and Chestnut building garages. Additionally, please dimension all exterior loading spaces and drop-off spaces.
40. How will the 6th floor roof on the Highland building be used? Will this roof be accessible to residents? Some elevations show trees on this roof; please clarify and provide details on the floor plans.
41. Building sections should include the underground connection between the Highland building and Campbell building.
42. Please confirm that the height of the Highland building as shown on the elevations was measured per the definition of "Building Height" within the Zoning Code.
43. Please confirm that the balconies on the northern elevation of the Campbell building will not encroach over the property line and into the public way. If so, an indemnification agreement with the Village will be required. Additionally, please confirm that all balconies will be constructed of a suitable material to allow for BBQ grills.
44. Please confirm that the Highland building loading spaces will have 14' of vertical clearance.
45. Please revise the plans to include details on the screening walls for the loading zones of the Campbell building (height, material, etc.).
46. Please revise the floor plans to provide details on the amenity space within the Highland building. Will this space include a fitness room? Meeting rooms? Business center? Clubroom/lounge room with a kitchen?

Market Study:

47. Previous correspondence indicated that the Chestnut building could potentially be developed as a condominium, however, the market study does not support a condominium development of a size as proposed in the Chestnut building. Please confirm that this building will be developed as rental and acknowledge that conversion to a condominium would require an amendment to the PUD and would need to be justified by a market study.
48. The market study states that storage lockers are a necessary feature in class A rental developments. No storage lockers were shown on the floor plans. Please confirm that each unit in the development will have a storage locker and outline the locations of such lockers on the floorplans.
49. The market study suggests that the development include an outdoor pool, which is a desired amenity in class A rental developments such as the Arlington 425 proposal. Please address the lack of swimming pool within the plan.
50. The market study identified some concern over the large size of many of the units and a concern that their large size may affect the ability to achieve the desired price point per square foot. Please address this situation.

Plat of Subdivision:

51. Dedication of land along Highland Avenue is required per the regulations of Chapter 29 of the Municipal Code and therefore a variation will be necessary to waive this requirement. The Village is currently evaluating whether the dedication 8' of land is necessary along Highland Avenue where the subject property does not abut the Vail Avenue garage. If this dedication is required, it must be shown on the Plat.
52. An easement for the sidewalk along the east side of the Campbell building may be necessary if 8' of land is **not** dedicated along that side of the site.
53. The required building setbacks must be shown on the Plat (20' along the Chestnut Avenue property line as measured from the east side of the dedicated area and 25' along the southern property line).
54. Please check with the Engineering Division to determine if easements will be required along the east, west, and southern property lines per Section 29-309 of Chapter 29.

Parking and Traffic:

55. The floor plans did not include the breakdown of square footage for restaurant space within the development. Please confirm that the numbers within the KLOA study represent the breakdown of total uses, and provide details on which floor each portion of the square footage for retail, office, and restaurant are located. The floor plans should also be adjusted to make this clear. Additionally, is 2nd floor retail space viable? It seems more likely that any retail space on the 2nd floor would be used as office as opposed to retail. If retail is proposed on the 2nd floor, please clarify how this will be viable. Finally, please note that the KLOA study lists the size of the retail space within the Highland building at 2,000 sq. ft. and the floorplans show this space as 3,023 sq. ft.
56. As previously mentioned, the downtown area may have a second evening peak in traffic, which occurs later than the 5:00pm-6:00pm peak identified in the KLOA study. The study did not contain any analysis of whether there is a second evening peak beyond the 5:00pm-6:00pm time. Please address this.
57. The traffic volumes during peak times do not show a need for two-lane egress along Campbell. Please revise to one lane of egress or clarify why two separate egress lanes have been provided.
58. The traffic distribution shows low volumes of ingress traffic utilizing the Campbell Street entrance during peak times, and the vast majority of traffic exiting the site through this point during peak times is projected to loop back

down to Sigwalt via Chestnut or Highland. One of the primary reasons for the Campbell Street access was to keep traffic off Chestnut and Highland, but the models do not show this occurring. Please address this situation.

59. The traffic volumes from Figure 7 of the KLOA study, when added to the volumes in Figure 8, do not equate to the volumes shown in Figure 9. Please revise these figures to model the correct traffic volumes.
60. The parking study should be revised to include a parking analysis showing the residential uses parked at 1.5 spaces per unit, but the commercial/office/retail spaces parked per the 2018 Rich & Associates parking study of downtown parking demand (see below):

Classification	Peak Hour Daytime Value (1:00 pm – 2:00 pm)	Peak Hour Evening Value 7:00 pm – 8:00 pm)
Retail (per 1,000 sq. ft)	1.32	0.72
Office (per 1,000 sq. ft)	1.62	0.23
Restaurant (per 1,000 sq. ft)	3.61	10.82
Metropolis Theater (per seat)	0.13	0.32
Residential (per dwelling unit)	0.60	1.82
Movie Theater (per seat)	0.09	0.17
Banquet hall (per attendee)	.012	0.60
Commuters	0.95	0.17

61. The traffic volumes from Figure 7 show that much of the traffic leaving the site will travel through the Campbell Street access point, with the majority of it ending up taking a right to loop south on Highland Avenue. Why wouldn't these cars instead take a more direct route of leaving the Highland building garage exit directly on Highland Avenue (assuming that many of them are residents and have access to the egress point on Highland)? What percentage of these trips are resident based vs. commercial/office/restaurant based?
62. Please clarify why the value at 6:00am in Table 7 for residential parking demand is 443 spaces ($307 \times 1.5 = 461$ spaces).
63. Please note that the Village is still evaluating the need for stop controls at Campbell/Highland, Chestnut/Campbell, Chestnut/Sigwalt, and Highland/Sigwalt.
64. The KLOA study should distinguish between residential traffic and commercial/office/restaurant traffic.
65. Given the reduction of on-street parking spaces along Campbell and Highland, combined with the increased demand for on-street parking spaces that will be created by the proposed retail/restaurant/office uses, please evaluate the possibility of opening up limited spaces within the development open for public parking.
66. Please provide a detailed explanation outlining how parking within the Highland Avenue garage will function for the commercial/office uses? How many spaces will be used for commercial/office uses? Where will they be located? How will access be restricted? How will customer parking be identified and assigned? How will employee parking be identified and assigned?
67. Please provide a detailed explanation for how parking for the residential units will be assigned. Will each unit have an assigned space, or will residential parking operate on a first come first served basis? Please note that the Rich & Associates 2018 parking study recommended that residential parking spaces are not assigned to specific

units (i.e. they are unbundled). How will access to these residential only spaces be restricted? How many will there be and where will they be located?

68. The number of parking spaces shown on the Highland building section drawings do not add up to the 454 number contained within the project narrative. Please revise and clarify if the 15' deep stalls were included in the overall parking stall count.
69. Recent changes to the IAC allow abutting handicap accessible stalls to share an access aisle. You are encouraged to take advantage of this provision, which would allow you to increase the parking stall count. In addition, please clarify the locations of all handicap parking stalls. It appears that the Highland building has only 5 handicap stalls where 9 would be required.
70. Please confirm that all proposed office uses will be general office and not medical office uses. Due to the higher parking demand generated by medical office uses, a condition of approval limiting these spaces to general office is likely.
71. The floorplans should include a note outlining how many bicycle parking spaces will be included within the Highland building. Will these spaces be available to the residents of each building, as well as the commercial/office tenants and the public? The streetscape improvements along Campbell should also include some sidewalk bicycle parking spaces.
72. The number of required loading spaces will be determined once the square footage of each floor has been provided. A variation may be required.

Prepared by:

SAM J. WEAVER

Planning & Community Development Dept. Review

February 4, 2019



ADDENDUM TO ROUND 1 PLANNING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

Project: Arlington 425
Block 425

Case Number: PC 18-010

Parking and Traffic:

73. The parking study should be revised to include a parking analysis showing the residential uses parked at 1.5 spaces per unit, but the office/restaurant/retail spaces parked per the ITE parking generation rates. The text on page 36 is misleading and states that "Using ITE parking rates and hourly distributions, a shared parking analysis was conducted under two scenarios". However, it appears that the scenario in Table 7 assigns office/restaurant/retail demand per Village Code requirements and does not use ITE generation rates.

Prepared by: SAM J. WISBE

Arlington 425
PC 19-001
January 29, 2019

Landscaping

- 1) Provide additional foundation plantings along Highland and Campbell.
- 2) Provide a detail of the proposed fence and retaining wall along the south property line.
- 3) Along the south elevation of 44 S. Highland incorporate ornamental trees and shrubs in order to soften the large span of wall. In addition, provide shade trees on the north elevation of 44 S. Highland.
- 4) On the landscape plan, indicate the location of the below grade parking and the outline of the detention area.
- 5) Provide additional screening adjacent to the transformer that is located south of 225 W. Campbell Street. In addition, provide a utility plan that identifies all mechanical units that are located at grade and indicate how they will be screened. All utilities must be fully screened with landscaping.
- 6) In order to soften the mass of the proposed building at 33 S. Chestnut, incorporate ornamental trees along the west elevation.
- 7) Provide a site furnishings package. It is recommended that large free standing planters be provided on the private property along Campbell and Highland.
- 8) Along Campbell and Highland incorporate bump outs at the corners and adjacent to each drive aisle.
- 9) Along Campbell and Highland there is a large spans of brick pavers between the back of curb and the proposed building. It is recommended that the area be further evaluated and that raised planters similar to the planters along Harmony Park be incorporated. In addition, it is recommended that the space at the corner be evaluated. This is a focal point and the space should be further developed.
- 10) Provide landscaping adjacent to the screen wall for the loading area that is located south of 225 S. Campbell near Highland.
- 11) The streetscape along Campbell and Highland must be consistent with the Downtown details/streetscape.
- 12) As more detailed plans are provided additional comments may be forthcoming.
- 13) Provide an interim landscape plan for each phase.



-BUMP OUTS

RAISED PLANTERS

HIGHLAND

TREES & SHRUBS

Plant Mix			
AGB0	Allium 'Globemaster'	Globemaster Flowering Onion	BULB
AT56	Allium tanguticum 'Summer Beauty'	Summer Beauty Ornamental Chive	1 GAL
NA50	Narcissus 'All Spring Mix'	All Spring Daffodil Mix	BULB
SE56	Sesleria autumnalis	Autumn Moor Grass	1 GAL

ISSUE DATE: January 10, 2019
All drawings are preliminary and subject to change
© 2019 Hitchcock Design Group

CCT

1/28/2019

7 S Vail Ave - Google Maps

Google Maps 7 S Vail Ave



Arlington Heights, Illinois



Street View - Jul 2017




Image capture: Jul 2017 © 2019 Google

ARLINGTON 425 – PC#: 19-001
PETITIONER RESPONSES TO ROUND 1 COMMENTS
FEBRUARY 25, 2019

RESPONSES TO BUILDING AND LIFE SAFETY DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

A. 44 S. Highland and 225 W. Campbell:

1. Clearly indicate on the plans all property lines.

Response: Duly noted and will comply.

2. The buildings shall be classified as high-rise, and meet all the requirements in 2009 IBC Section 403.

Response: Duly noted and will comply.

3. Provide the proposed construction type for each building.

Response: Our renderings reflect the intended ultimate appearance of these buildings. Power Construction Company has been engaged to explore “solid masonry” structural types that will meet code, provide construction and maintenance cost benefits, and help to better our construction timelines. The Highland Building and Campbell Building are anticipated to use Type I-B construction.

4. Exterior wall ratings shall meet the requirements of 2009 IBC Table 602.

Response: Duly noted and will comply. Will be included in CDs.

5. Each building will be reviewed as separated mixed use of S-2, M, and R-2. Provide the proposed hourly separation between each use per 2009 IBC Table 508.4.

Response: Duly noted and will comply.

6. Separation for incidental use areas shall follow the requirements of 2009 IBC Table 508.2.5.

Response: Duly noted and will comply.

7. The buildings shall comply with the 2018 Illinois Accessibility Code which went into effect on November 1, 2018.

Response: Duly noted and will comply.

8. Provide a height and area calculation for each building.

Response: Heights and area calculations for each building are included in the submitted documentation as well as the “Zoning Matrix” provided by the Village and completed by Petitioner.

9. A Fire Command Center shall be provided for each building per 2009 IBC 403.4.5, and meet the requirements of Section 911 of the IBC.

Response: Duly noted and will comply.

10. Provide the proposed construction type of the bridge at 225 W. Campbell.

Response: The previously shown overhead bridge at 225 W. Campbell has been removed from the Plans.

11. At least one elevator in each building shall be provided for fire department emergency access to all floors. The elevator car shall be of such a size and arrangement to accommodate an ambulance stretcher in its horizontal, open position, provide the interior cab size shall not be less than **60 inches by 85 inches**, and shall be identified by the International Symbol for emergency medical services (Star of Life). The Symbol shall be not less than 3 inches high and shall be placed inside on both sides of the hoist-way door frame.

Response: Duly noted and will comply.

12. The trash termination rooms shall comply with the requirements of Table 508.2.5 and Section 708.13.1.

Response: Duly noted and will comply.

13. Provide a proposed occupant load for each building, including for the assembly uses on the roofs of each building.

Response: Will be included in CDs.

14. Each building shall be provided the proper number of area of refuges with two-way communication and shall comply with the requirements of 2009 IBC Section 1007.6.

Response: Duly noted and will comply.

15. Provide details on the tunnel for the 44 S. Highland building. Where does the tunnel connect? Include construction details, dimensions, and distances to exists.

Response: Additional design information for the tunnel has been included in the revised drawings.

16. At the time of permit submittal for each building, structural calculations shall be provided for all structural components and any/all roof top elements, amenities.

Response: Duly noted and will comply.

17. Automatic smoke detection shall be provided and comply with IFC 907.2.13.

Response: Duly noted and will comply.

B. 33 S. Chestnut:

1. Provide the proposed construction type for the building.

Response: Our renderings reflect the intended ultimate appearance of these buildings. Power Construction Company has been engaged to explore masonry-clad frame structural types that will meet code, provide construction and maintenance cost benefits, and help to better our construction timelines. The Chestnut Building is anticipated to use Type V-A construction.

2. Exterior wall ratings shall meet the requirements of 20009 IBC Table 602.

Response: Duly noted and will comply.

3. The building will be reviewed as separated mixed use of S-2, and R-2.

Response: Duly noted.

4. Provide the proposed hourly separation between each use per 2009 IBC Table 508.4.

Response: Will be included in CDs.

5. Separation for incidental use areas shall follow the requirements of 2009 IBC Table 508.2.5.

Response: Duly noted and will comply.

6. The building shall comply with the 2018 Illinois Accessibility Code which went into effect on November 1, 2018.

Response: Duly noted and will comply.

7. Provide a height and area calculation for the building.

Response: Heights and area calculations for each building are included in the submitted documentation as well as the “Zoning Matrix” provided by the Village and completed by Petitioner.

8. At least one elevator in each building shall be provided for fire department emergency access to all floors. The elevator car shall be of such a size and arrangement to accommodate an ambulance stretcher in its horizontal, open position, provide the interior cab size shall not be less than **60 inches by 85 inches**, and shall be identified by the International Symbol for

emergency medical services (Star of Life). The Symbol shall be not less than 3 inches high and shall be placed inside on both sides of the hoist-way door frame.

Response: Duly noted and will comply.

9. The trash termination room(s) shall comply with the requirements of Table 508.2.5 and Section 708.13.1.

Response: Duly noted and will comply.

10. Provide a proposed occupant load for the building, including for the assembly uses on the roof of the building.

Response: Will be included in CDs.

11. The building shall be provided the proper number of area of refuges with two-way communication and shall comply with the requirements of 2009 IBC Section 1007.6.

Response: Duly noted and will comply.

12. At the time of permit submittal for the building, structural calculations shall be provided for all structural components and any/all roof top elements, amenities.

Response: Duly noted and will comply.

ARLINGTON 425 – PC#: 19-001
PETITIONER RESPONSES TO ROUND 1 COMMENTS
FEBRUARY 25, 2019

RESPONSES TO FIRE SAFETY DIVISION COMMENTS

1. All currently adopted codes shall apply including the 2000 Edition of the Life Safety Code, NFPA 101.

Response: Duly noted and will comply.

2. The entrance off of Highland Ave shows a width of 17 feet with additional width on either side using brick pavers. Brick pavers are not an approved surface for fire lanes.

Response: The unit paving product data and technical information will be provided that indicate compliance with Village requirements.

3. Buildings or portions of buildings or facilities exceeding 30 feet in height above the lowest level of fire department vehicle access shall be provided with approved fire apparatus access roads capable of accommodating fire department aerial apparatus. Overhead utility and power lines shall not be located within the aerial fire apparatus access roadway.

Response: Duly noted and will comply.

4. Aerial fire apparatus access roads shall have a minimum unobstructed width of 26 feet exclusive of shoulders, in the immediate vicinity of any building or portion of building more than 30 feet in height.

Response: Duly noted and will comply.

5. At least one of the required access routes for aerial fire apparatus shall be located within a minimum of 15 feet and a maximum of 30 feet from the building, and shall be positioned parallel to one entire side of the building.

Response: Duly noted and will be provided with length of parallel position on buildings to be Code compliant.

6. The truck auto-turn drawing shows fire apparatus entering the complex from S. Highland Ave and while turning the front end is extending beyond the roadway over the parkway. No obstructions should be permitted in this area.

Response: No obstructions will be permitted in turning radius area. The autoturn diagrams have been updated in the updated Traffic Study.

7. The truck auto-turn shows fire apparatus traveling through the complex and existing on to Campbell Street and in the process traveling under the building connection. It is not clear if fire apparatus would clear the height of the portion over the roadway.

Response: Although height clearances meet IDOT requirements under the Campbell building, Petitioner is not anticipating that the Campbell entry/exit be considered an apparatus access road. Apparatus access roads will be from Highland to Chestnut and through the courtyard.

8. There is no auto-turn drawing showing fire apparatus accessing the area of the “courtyard” for accessing the exposure of the west side of the 44 S. Highland building.

Response: The autoturn diagrams for this movement are included in the updated Traffic Study.

9. The main fire lane to circle is made of brick pavers. Brick pavers is not an allowable surface for fire lanes.

Response: Plans have been revised to incorporate a mountable fire lane that is installed and properly located with Code compliant reinforced lawn pavers.

10. The “reinforced lawn” area is using brick pavers which is not allowable. In addition, drawings show that there are structures and other obstructions in this area that would prevent fire apparatus from traversing the entire length of the building as required.

Response: An approved 26’-0” wide fire lane will be provided as required with Code compliant reinforced lawn pavers. Landscaping plans will be revised to remove any structures and other obstructions in this area that would prevent fire apparatus from traversing the Code required length of the building.

11. Fire apparatus access roads shall extend to within 150 feet of all portions of buildings and all portions of the exterior walls of the first story of buildings as measured by an approved route around the exterior of each building.

Response: Duly noted and will comply, other than east side of 44 S. Highland building due to location of Village parking garage.

12. Fire apparatus access roads (non-aerial operations) shall have an unobstructed width of not less than 20 feet, exclusive of shoulders.

Response: Although height clearances meet IDOT requirements under the Campbell building, we are not anticipating that the Campbell entry/exit be considered an apparatus access road. Apparatus access roads will be from Highland to Chestnut and through the courtyard. Dimensions have been

added to engineering plans for clarity.

13. Fire apparatus access roads shall be designed and maintained to support the imposed loads of fire apparatus and shall be surfaced so as to provide all weather driving capabilities.

Response: Duly noted and will comply.

14. New buildings four or more stories above grade plane, except those with a roof slope greater than four units vertical in 12 units horizontal, shall be provided with a stairway to the roof. Stairway access to the roof shall be in accordance with Section 1009.12. Such stairways shall be marked at street and floor levels with a sign indicating that the stairway continues to the roof. Where roofs are used for roof gardens or for other purposes, stairways shall be provided as required for such occupancy classification.

Response: Duly noted and will be included in CDs.

15. Where required and in all buildings classified as high-rise buildings by the International Building Code, a fire command center for fire department operations shall be provided.

Response: Petitioner will work with the Village Fire Department to meet all applicable codes.

16. The location and accessibility of the fire command center shall be located on the first floor and approved by the fire chief. The fire command center shall be separated from the remainder of the building by not less than a 1 hour fire barrier or horizontal assembly or both.

Response: Duly noted and will be included in CDs.

17. The fire command center shall be a minimum of 200 square feet in area with a minimum dimension of 10 feet. A layout of the fire command center and all features required by this section to be contained therein shall be submitted for approval prior to installation.

Response: Duly noted and will be included in CDs

18. The fire command center shall comply with HFPA 72 and shall contain the following features:

- a. The emergency voice/alarm communication system control unit.
- b. The fire department communications system.
- c. Fire detection and alarm system annunciator.
- d. Annunciator unit visually indicating the location of the elevators and whether they are operational.
- e. Status indicators and controls for air distribution systems.
- f. The fire-fighter's control panel required by Section 909.16 for smoke control systems installed in the building.
- g. Controls for unlocking stairway doors simultaneously.

- h. Sprinkler valve and water-flow detector display panels.
- i. Emergency and standby power status indicators.
- j. A telephone for fire department use with controlled access to the public telephone system.
- k. Fire pump status indicators.
- l. Schematic building plans indicating the typical floor plan and detailing the building core, means of egress, fire protection systems, fire-fighting equipment and fire department access, and the location of fire walls, fire barriers, fire partitions, smoke barriers and smoke partitions.
- m. Work table.
- n. Generator supervision devices, manual start and transfer features.
- o. Public address system, where specifically required.
- p. Elevator fire recall switch in accordance with ASMEA17.1.
- q. Elevator emergency or standby power selector switch(es), where emergency or standby power is provided.

Response: Duly noted and will be included in CDs.

19. Buildings shall have approved radio coverage for emergency responders within the building based upon the existing coverage levels of the public safety communication systems of the jurisdiction at the exterior of the building.

Response: Duly noted and will be included in CDs.

20. Emergency and standby power systems shall be provided where required per the International Fire Code and International Building Code.

Response: Duly noted and will be included in CDs.

21. Fire department connections shall be located on the street side of buildings, fully visible and located at the main front entrance of the building and within a maximum travel distance of 100 feet to the nearest fire hydrant and in accordance with the NFPA standard applicable to the system design. The location of fire department connections shall be approved.

Response: Duly noted and will be included in CDs.

22. Sprinkler access/equipment room should be located on the first floor.

Response: Duly noted and will be included in CDs.

23. A complete NFPA compliant fire suppression system is required. Supervised indicating control valves shall be provided at the point of connection to the riser on each floor.

Response: Duly noted and will be included in CDs

24. An approved water supply, capable of supplying the required fire flow for fire protection, shall be provided.

Response: Duly noted and will be included in CDs.

25. Fire protection equipment and service rooms shall be identified in an approved manner.

Response: Duly noted and will be included in CDs

26. Approved access shall be provided and maintained for all fire protection equipment to permit immediate safe operation and maintenance of such equipment.

Response: Duly noted and will be included in CDs.

27. In buildings and structures where standby power is required or furnished to operate an elevator, the operation shall comply with current code requirements.

Response: Duly noted and will be included in CDs.

28. A fully functional fire alarm with zoning indicator capabilities shall be installed per NFPA 72. The alarm annunciator panel shall be located at the front entrance.

Response: Duly noted and will be included in CDs.

29. Shop drawings for fire alarm systems shall be submitted for review and approval prior to system installation.

Response: Duly noted and will comply.

30. Visible alarm notification appliances shall be provided in public areas and common areas. A visible exterior weatherproof alarm notification device shall be located within close proximity to the front main entrance of the building or tenant space.

Response: Duly noted and will be included in CDs.

31. A key box (Know Box) shall be provided and contain keys to gain necessary access as required by the fire code official.

Response: Duly noted and will be included in CDs.

32. Fire pumps, if provided, shall be installed in accordance with the Fire Code and NFPA 20 and shall comply with all current code requirements including a minimum of two water mains located in different streets.

Response: Duly noted and will be included in CDs.

33. Exit signs shall be illuminated at all times and have emergency power backup.

Response: Duly noted and will be included in CDs.

34. In order to be considered part of an accessible means of egress, an elevator shall comply with the emergency operation and signaling device requirements.

Response: Duly noted and will be included in CDs.

35. In buildings where a required accessible floor is four or more stories above or below a level of exit discharge, at least one required accessible means of egress shall be an elevator with some exceptions.

Response: Duly noted and will be included in CDs.

36. In buildings four or more stories above grade plan, one stairway shall extend to the roof surface, unless the roof has a slope steeper than four units vertical in 12 units horizontal.

Response: Duly noted and will be included in CDs.

37. Buildings shall have approved address numbers.

Response: Address numbers are assigned by the United States Postal Service and are not the decision of the Petitioner.

38. Signs shall be posted on both sides of an approach of any fire lane stating, "NO PARKING – FIRE LANE". Signs shall have arrows indicating the area of parking restriction.

Response: Duly noted and will be included in CDs.

39. Fire lane signs shall be white with red three-inch letters. The dimensions of the sign shall be 12 inches horizontally and 18 inches vertically. These signs shall be installed so that the top of the sign is no less than 6 feet nor more than 6 feet above grade.

Response: Duly noted and will be included in CDs.

40. All new elevators shall be equipped with emergency key opening devices at all landings. The location and specific type of device shall be approved by the Fire Department.

Response: Duly noted and will be included in CDs.

41. If the elevator uses an automatic dialer, the ten digit number 847-590-3470 shall be used. If bidirectional communication is available and is used, the elevator should call 911. The phone line used to dial 911 must have the correct address information affiliated with that phone line.

Response: Duly noted and will be included in CDs.

42. Emergency Signs required for elevators shall be 7 inches by 5 inches and read as follows:
IN FIRE EMERGENCY, DO NOT USE ELEVATOR. USE EXIT STAIRS.

Response: Duly noted and will be included in CDs.

43. At least one elevator shall be provided for fire department emergency access to all floors. The elevator car shall be of such a size and arrangement to accommodate an ambulance stretcher in its horizontal, open position, provided the cab size shall be not less than 60 inches by 85 inches, to accommodate an ambulance stretcher in its horizontal, open position; and shall be identified by the International Symbol for emergency medical services (Star of Life). The Symbol shall be not less than 3 inches high and shall be placed inside on both sides of the hoist-way door frame.

Response: Duly noted and will be included in CDs.

ARLINGTON 425 – PC#: 19-001
PETITIONER RESPONSES TO ROUND 1 COMMENTS
FEBRUARY 25, 2019

RESPONSE TO ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

- 1-10. No response required. Part of Engineering Department form.
11. The petitioner is notified that these comments are being provided to ensure that the project meets the requirements for submittal to the Plan Commission. Approval by the Plan Commission is not an endorsement or approval of these documents to obtain the required building permits, engineering approval, or permits required by other government or permitting agencies for construction. Detailed plan review with associated comments will be provided upon submittal of plans for a building permit. The petitioner shall acknowledge that they accept this understanding.

Response: Petitioner acknowledges and accepts this understanding.

12. Since a subdivision is being proposed, the plans must meet all subdivision requirements. Final engineering plans for all public improvements must be approved prior to the final plat of subdivision approval. An Engineer's estimate of construction cost for full site improvements is required to complete the calculation for plan review, inspection, and other fees. An Engineer's estimate of construction cost for public improvements is also required to complete the calculation for the required public improvement guarantee deposit. The public improvements for this development would be sidewalk, curb and gutter, widening of Chestnut Ave for parking, and street lighting. These estimates should be submitted at least three weeks prior to the final Plan Commission meeting to allow us time to generate the fee letter and for the petitioner to assemble the proper documents.

Response: The requested engineer's opinion of probable construction cost for public improvements will be provided to the Village as part of the final engineering submittal at least three weeks prior to the final Plan Commission meeting.

13. Final engineering plans shall be georeferenced by using State Plan Coordinate system – Illinois East. Below are details about projection:

Projected Coordinate System:	Transverse_Mercator
False_Easting:	984250.00000000
False_Northing:	0.00000000
Central_Meridian:	-88.33333333
Scale_Factor:	0.99997500
Latitude_Of_Origin:	36.66666667
Linear Unit:	Foot_US
Geographic Coordinate System:	GCS_North_American_1983

Datum:	D_North_American_1983
Prime Meridian:	Greenwich
Angular Unit:	Degree

Response: The final engineering plans for the project will be georeferenced to the requested State Plane projection.

14. The Final Plat of Subdivision must be reviewed and approved by Engineering prior to final Plan Commission approval. The original signed mylar Final Plat of Subdivision, containing all non-Village signatures, shall be submitted one week before the scheduled date of the final Plan Commission meeting. Village Code Section 29-209 also requires a digital copy of the plat to be provided on disk to the Village. The petitioner shall acknowledge that they accept this understanding.

Response: Petitioner accepts this understanding.

15. The proposed detention/retention facility will be a private system and as such will not be the Village's responsibility to maintain. An Onsite Utility Maintenance Agreement must be executed prior to final engineering approval. Please contact the Village Engineer for an editable version of the OUMA.

Response: The requested Onsite Utility Maintenance Agreement (OUMA) will be submitted and executed with the final engineering submittal.

16. The preliminary detention calculations are acceptable. Final approval will require final engineering plans including calculations for storage provided and details of the detention system. The detention storage system located under pavement must be designed to AASHTO HS-25 loading standard. Restrictors between 2" and 4" must be in a trap in a catch basin. Regarding the hood, for reference is a removal hood detail from the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District. Provide a detail showing the restrictor catch basin.

Response: Understood and agreed. The requested restrictor catch basin detail has been added to Sheet 5 of the preliminary engineering plan set.

17. Provide a site photometric lighting diagram indicating lighting intensities. Also provide the associated catalog cuts for all roadway, parking lot, and building mounted luminaires. All fixtures must be flat bottom, sharp cut-off, and no wall pack style fixtures will be permitted.

Response: Understood and agreed. Photometric lighting diagrams and associated catalog cuts for all roadway, parking lot, and building mounted luminaires will be prepared and submitted during design development phase.

18. The fire truck maneuver exhibits provided only show fire truck access to the Campbell St. building. Provide the necessary exhibits to show how the Chestnut Ave. and Highland Ave. buildings will be accessed.

Response: Plans have been revised to provide all required 26'-0" wide fire access roads. The updated fire truck turning maneuvers are included in the updated Traffic Study.

19. The existing conditions survey is from the year 2002 and does not show the existing Vail Garage structure over Highland Avenue. Other surface and/or underground improvements have been made in the interim. The existing conditions must be checked and updated to enable cogent comments.

Response: All existing condition information for the Highland Avenue R.O.W. area under the Vail Street garage have been added to the preliminary engineering plans.

20. Provide additional information to show the clearance of all trucks for the access off Campbell St., under the Campbell St. building.

Response: The clearance as indicated on the elevations will be 13'-6" high to meet IDOT requirements.

21. The maneuvers provided for all trucks (single unit, garbage and fire truck) appear to be problematic for the Campbell St. entrance, the drop off area on the north side of the Chestnut Ave. building, and the drop off area on the north side of the Highland Ave. building. In the event vehicles are parked in the drop off area, the trucks will not be able to complete the turn. Snow removal operations must take into consideration maintaining the space needed for all vehicles to maneuver.

Response: Duly noted and agree. "No parking or standing" signs will be provided at the drop-off areas to eliminate this condition.

22. Fire lanes adjacent to buildings must have a minimum pavement width as directed by the Fire Department to accommodate the tower truck's outriggers. Fire lanes require a heavy duty pavement section. Asphalt pavement section to consist of: 2" Surface, 2-1/4" N-50 Binder, and 4" CA-6 Stone Subbase. Concrete driveway apron to be 8" thick. The proposed permeable pavers, brick pavers and reinforced lawn located in the fire lane must be designed with a cross section that meets or exceeds the structural number of the Village's heavy duty pavement section specified. The heavy duty pavement section must also be shown on the fire truck maneuver exhibits. Provide a cross section for the underground parking and reinforced lawn (fire lane).

Response: Petitioner has submitted calculations demonstrating that the structural number for the proposed permeable paver fire lane pavement section exceeds the structural number of the Village's heavy duty asphalt fire lane pavement section. For consideration, the product data and technical information of the reinforced lawn fire lane will be provided that indicate compliance with Village requirements. All other information in this comment is duly noted, and Petitioner will comply.

23. The fire lane between the Chestnut Ave. and Highland Ave. buildings is shown as "reinforced lawn". Fire lanes require a hard surface and must be plowed for year-round access.

Response: Fire lanes will be constructed and maintained for proper year-round access. Reinforced lawn fire lanes can be plowed for year-round access. Snow removal operators will lift blade 1” to remove snow without damaging the tray system or lawn.

24. Coordinate possible fire lane cross access with the parcel located south of the proposed development.

Response: Given significant site constraints and requirements, Petitioner does not believe that cross-access is achievable. Ownership has preliminarily discussed with the proposed petitioner of the adjoining property. Indications from that petitioner are that based on its currently proposed configuration of the property, fire lane access will not be possible.

25. The setback for the Chestnut Ave. building is shown from the existing right-of-way. Provide the setback to the proposed right-of-way.

Response: The setback dimension for the Chestnut building has been revised to the proposed R.O.W. line on Sheet 3 of the preliminary engineering plans as requested.

26. The setback shown on the south side of the Highland Ave. building is 12.4 ft. The information presented to the Village Board references a requested variance of 12.9 ft. for the Highland Ave. building. Clarify this setback.

Response: The setback along the south side of the Highland Ave has been revised to 12.9 ft on Sheet 3 of the preliminary engineering plan set.

27. The public sidewalk across all access points must meet the Public Right-of-Way Accessibility Guidelines, including 2% maximum cross slope. In the event there will be a stop sign or yield sign at a driveway, detectable warning panels will be required. The island at the Campbell St. access is within the pedestrian access route and should be revised to provide clear access across the entire access. Sidewalks take precedence through driveways. Driveway curb returns shall not go through sidewalks. Additional grades and details will be necessary at final engineering.

Response: The requested grading details will be included in the final engineering plans.

28. The plans do not accurately show the existing conditions near the intersection of Campbell St. and Chestnut Ave., including the current striping, crosswalk, and ADA ramp at the SE corner of Campbell St. and Chestnut Ave. Revise the plans accordingly.

Response: The existing conditions for the intersection of Campbell St. and Chestnut Ave. have been updated with the current striping, crosswalk, and ADA ramp.

29. The access to the underground parking for the Chestnut Ave. building is shown at 10% , which may present issues during inclement weather such as snow or ice. The petitioner may

want to consider providing a heating element.

Response: The Chestnut Avenue down ramp will include a heating element.

30. The preliminary grading plan shows a retaining wall along the entire south property line, ranging in height from ½ ft. to 4½ ft. Revise the grading and proposed elevations accordingly such that the retaining wall will not be necessary. The wall around the Chestnut Ave. access to the underground parking garage is acceptable.

Response: Due to the proposed underground parking structure between the Highland Ave. and Chestnut St. buildings, the retaining wall cannot be eliminated. As part of the final grading design, the design team will work to reduce the height of this wall as much as possible. The grading along the south side of the Highland Ave. building has been revised on Sheet 4 of the preliminary engineering plan set.

31. The proposed sanitary sewer service for the Highland Ave. building is less than 10 ft. from the proposed water service. This can be addressed at final engineering.

Response: This will be addressed as part of the final engineering design for the project.

32. The proposed sanitary sewer service for the Campbell St. building crosses the existing 10" water main along Campbell St. and may be in conflict. Verify the depth of the existing water main and show additional information for this and all crossings. This can be addressed at final engineering.

Response: This will be addressed as part of the final engineering design for the project.

33. The submittal references that the project will be constructed in two phases, with the Chestnut Ave. and underground parking garage being constructed as the second phase. Additional information should be provided to show the limits of the two phases, the limits of the underground garage to be constructed in the first phase, and verify that the fire access will not be affected during construction of Phase II.

Response: Phase II includes the underground garage in the courtyard and the 4-story building with basement parking on Chestnut. We will work with the Fire Department on various options if we construct the courtyard garage later or will otherwise include it in Phase I.

34. Provide preliminary information on how the utilities will be provided to the buildings (ComEd, Nicor, etc.) and how any existing utilities will be addressed.

Response: Utilities: ComEd, NICOR, ATT, COMCAST; will be serving the development with underground services to each building. Existing utilities on the property will be relocated underground to the public way then run overhead as is the current installation. Meetings have been held with ComEd and NICOR and each are preparing service plans.

Preliminary Plat of Subdivision:

35. The Subdivision Code requires the dedication of eight feet of right-of-way along the west side of Highland Ave. The Village is still evaluating whether a variation to waive the dedication of the portion of the side along Highland Ave. that abuts the Vail Ave. garage is reasonable.

Response: An 8' right-of-way dedication has been added to the preliminary Plat along the west side of Highland Avenue, except within the Vail Street Garage footprint.

36. All building setback lines shall be shown on the plat.

Response: Building setback lines have been added to the preliminary plat.

37. For the Final Plat of Subdivision, use the attached Final Plat of Subdivision Checklist. The elementary school district is Consolidated Community School District #25, Township High School District #214, Harper Community College District #512.

Response: This information will be added to the final plat of subdivision.

Traffic:

38. Reconcile the differences between engineering and architect's plans regarding width and paving material of internal roadways, driveways, sidewalks, drop off/loading lanes, and on-street parking. Chestnut Building driveway must be 24 ft. width by code.

Response: Drawings have been adjusted to comply.

39. Provide driveway curb cut width of Campbell Street driveway. Curb returns for driveway and at intersections should be 25 ft. radius typical, 20 ft. min.

Response: Drawings have been adjusted to comply.

40. Include the Village standard detail for the streetscape cross section for paving brick, concrete ribbons, tree placement, etc.

Response: Duly noted and agree. Streetscape details for paving brick, concrete ribbons, tree placement, etc. will be provided during design development phase.

41. The traffic report identifies the need to establish proper sight distance for driveways and street intersections. Provide exhibit showing required sight triangles. Modify on street parking accordingly.

Response: Exhibits showing the sight distance triangles will be prepared and are included in the updated plans.

42. All intersections at existing stop signs must comply with state law: No Parking 30 ft. in

advance of and 20 ft. departing a stop sign; No Parking within 15 ft. of a fire hydrant.

Response: Drawings and Traffic Study have been adjusted to comply.

43. Show pedestrian access from the proposed site to the existing Vail Garage at the north entrance at Highland Avenue. Since there is no pedestrian walkway on the west side of Highland underneath the Vail Garage, north-south pedestrian movement along Highland Avenue needs to be along the existing walk on the east side of the street underneath the garage.

Response: Architectural and Civil Plans will be adjusted to show pedestrian access across Highland.

44. The proximity of drop off lanes adjacent to the single inbound and outbound lanes of the proposed Campbell Street driveway poses possible conflicts with opening car doors, cars queuing to use this feature, cars double parking to unload passengers, and vehicle occupants moving across the lanes to get to the section of the building opposite from where they are being dropped off. Is there a center barrier between lanes to prevent crossing pedestrian movements? Provide comment on how to mitigate these concerns.

Response: The drop off areas are located off to the side of the drive aisle, similar to on-street parking. There is adequate room for vehicles to pass by vehicles that are stopped to allow for the boarding and alighting of passengers, which will occur on the curb side. Further, pedestrian movements across the lanes will be minimal since each building will have its own designated drop-off lane. There is a center island, and a pedestrian crossing will be incorporated across the center island.

45. Show centerline striping on Highland Avenue south of Campbell Street to channelize traffic for the entrance to the Vail Garage.

Response: The requested centerline striping on Highland Ave. has been added to Sheet 3 of the preliminary engineering plans.

46. Suggest protection of the side panels of the Vail Garage panels by placement of bollards or concrete Jersey wall type barriers adjacent to opening.

Response: Existing bollards protecting the Vail garage opening will be maintained.

47. Southbound traffic from Campbell Street from under the Campbell building when entering the traffic circle needs pavement marking, arrows, and/or signage in the median showing the one-way counter-clockwise flow for the circle.

Response: The requested pavement markings and signage have been added to Sheet 3 of the preliminary engineering plans.

48. Since traffic from the Campbell Street driveway can access the Highland building parking garage entrance at the northwest corner of the building, only a right turn into the garage

driveway is permitted. Signage or pavement markings to prohibit vehicles from continuing easterly needs to be provided.

Response: The requested pavement markings and signage have been added to Sheet 3 of the preliminary engineering plans.

49. The same informational striping, arrows, and/or signage needs to be provided for westbound traffic from Highland Avenue entering the traffic circle.

Response: The requested pavement markings and signage have been added to Sheet 3 of the preliminary engineering plans.

50. Traffic exiting this garage exit at the northwest corner of the Highland building can only turn left and proceed around the traffic circle. Provide pavement markings and/or signage prohibiting right turns out of the driveway.

Response: The requested pavement markings and signage have been added to Sheet 3 of the preliminary engineering plans.

51. Based on the traffic counts, this driveway is the predominate access point to the Highland building garage. Traffic turning in, coming from the east turning left into the garage, results in a lot of required turns and forced traffic flow in a very compressed area. Provide comment on how to mitigate these concerns.

Response: Vehicles turning left into the garage from the east and turning right into the garage from the west will be under free flow conditions. Vehicles exiting the garage will be under stop sign control and will be restricted to left-out only turning movements. Further, signage indicating the turning restriction and one-way travel will be provided. Further, a majority of the residential garage traffic will enter/exit from the south Highland entry. See the updated Traffic Study for further information

52. The magnitude and impact of this project on adjacent roadways has the potential to be significant and cause surface and sub-surface damage. Final engineering plans should include pavement patching and resurfacing of the half streets adjacent to the development. The Village reserves the right to require street reconstruction should that be required based on actual damage. Current standards for streets with one sided parking is 32 ft. b-b of curb, (for Chestnut Avenue) and two sided parking cross section is 43 ft. b-b of curb, (for Highland Avenue).

Response: Duly noted and will comply.

53. The existing truck loading operations on the east side of Highland Avenue often congest traffic along the street. When trucks occupy the loading bay, other trucks staging do not have a clear area while waiting. Introduction of two more loading docks within 50 ft. south of this area would suggest freight clutter staging along Highland Avenue. Provide anticipated truck delivery operations, scheduling, and number of trucks that would be necessary to service these buildings. Additionally, the location where this is shown requires modification to the

Vail Garage structure to remove the existing concrete skirt panels that are only 8-9 ft. above grade, limiting vertical clearance.

Response: Walker Consultants has determined that these panels are the appropriate existing Vail Street garage panels to be removed. Other panels in other locations will have negative structural consequences. We intend to relocate the Highland Building loading dock south to be just north of the garage entry. The exact location is subject to the Vail Street garage column locations.

54. Will the existing Vail Garage require shoring or steel sheeting to retain footing integrity once excavation for the Highland Building commences?

Response: Shoring or sheeting of the Vail Garage is not anticipated.

55. At Chestnut Avenue, and also necessary at the Highland Avenue intersections with Campbell Street, the existing overhead high mast lighting must be provided to provide required street intersection illumination.

Response: Plans have been revised to indicate one existing overhead mast light at the intersection of Chestnut St. and Campbell St. and one new overhead mast light at the intersection of Campbell St. and Highland Ave.

56. Where on the property will bicycle parking be provided?

Response: There is bicycle parking shown in the Highland garage and in the basement of the Campbell Building. Additional required bicycle parking will be provided and coordinated with staff.

57. As part of the final plans, a preliminary construction management schedule, maintenance of traffic plan, identification of potential utilization of Village Streets for construction staging, public sidewalk closures, areas for materials storage, and requested detour routing, must be provided. The finalized construction schedule, maintenance of traffic, and construction staging plan must be submitted by the contractor as part of the building permit.

Response: Power Construction has presented a site logistics plan which addresses these issues. A final plan will be presented once the zoning is approved. Our intent is to begin construction of Phase I in Spring/Summer of 2020 with a 2 year construction period. Phase II start will be subject to market conditions.

58. Traffic Report Figure 3, is incorrect for the all way stop signage shown at Wing St. and Vail Ave.

Response: The updated Traffic Study addresses this condition.

59. Traffic Report Figure 4 must be corrected for 'Inset B', which shows three intersecting driveways along the north side of the street. However, the text on page 8 refers to four driveways.

Response: The “third” driveway to the east is actually a garage that has two ingress and egress garage doors, but acts as one driveway off Campbell Street. The Traffic Study has been updated accordingly.

60. Traffic Report Table 1 Accident Data, I.D.O.T. summary seems to underrepresent the accident experience based upon the retrieval of AHPD accidents at the Highland and Campbell intersection. Accident reports for the four intersections adjacent to the site must be retrieved from the Police Department for analysis.

Response: A cursory review of the accident data provided by the Arlington Heights Police Department shows that there was, on average, one or less incidents per year at each of the respective intersections within a six-year period. As such, there is a low volume of accident history overall on the surrounding roadway network.

61. Traffic Report page 13, has a typo for access to the Highland Building from Chestnut Avenue. In addition, the discussion suggesting loading operations along the widened section of Chestnut Avenue is not supported.

Response: The Traffic Study has been updated accordingly.

62. Traffic Report page 14, explains the number of internal drop off/loading areas, but provides evaluation of the competition for use of the areas between pedestrians and delivery vehicles.

Response: The Traffic Study has been updated accordingly.

63. Evaluate the motorists’ sight distance exiting the driveway from the Highland Building under the Vail Garage.

Response: A sight distance study has been completed and will be included in the updated Traffic Study.

64. Traffic Report page 17, needs to provide some discussion to explain the use of ITE land use code 220, rather than utilizing codes 221, 222, or 223 as more representative of these buildings. Please provide calculations and pages cited from the ITE 10th edition. Also provide the Retail, Restaurant, and Office generation rates.

Response: ITE data is included in the appendix of the updated Traffic Study. ITE Land Use Code 220 was used to provide for a conservative study since it has the highest rates compared to the Land Use Code 221 or Land Use Code 222 as shown in the table below.

ITE Land Use Code	Weekday AM Average Rate	Weekday PM Average Rate	Weekday Daily Average Rate
220	0.46	0.56	7.32
221	0.36	0.44	5.44
222	0.31	0.36	4.45

65. Traffic Report page 19, Figure 7: It is confusing why southbound traffic on Chestnut from Campbell Street generates 22, (23) vehicles S.B. that seem to bypass the site.

Response: Site traffic assignments have been modified in the the updated Traffic Study.

66. Traffic Report page 19, Figure 7: Similarly, for southbound Highland traffic from Campbell Street, 34, (45) S.B. trips bypass the garage driveway into the Highland Building seemingly not entering or exiting the site.

Response: Site traffic assignments have been modified in the updated Traffic Study.

67. Traffic Report page 19, Figure 7: Internal trip generation values from the Highland Building northwest corner driveway should be provided since this seems like the higher volume generator from that building.

Response: Trip assignments at the internal garage access are included in the updated Traffic Study.

68. Traffic Report page 19, Figure 7: There are arithmetic errors on the exhibit that do not equal the values shown in Table 2.

Response: The figures are updated in the updated Traffic Study. It is important to note that the capacity analyses used the correct traffic volumes.

69. Traffic Report page 21: There are numerous errors for the summation of values of Figures 7 & 8 suggested as the final projected counts for the intersections of Ridge, Chestnut, and Highland with Campbell Street, as well as the Intersections of Chestnut and Highland with Sigwalt Street. Revise and correct these counts and rerun the Synchro analysis to verify the accuracy of the LOS values as required.

Response: The figures are updated in the updated Traffic Study. It is important to note that the capacity analyses used the correct traffic volumes.

70. The report did not discuss weekend or nighttime traffic count or parking data when the other business have their peak hour of the generator.

Response: Traffic counts were conducted at the intersections of Campbell with Chestnut, Highland, and Vail, and at the Highland and Sigwalt intersection on Thursday, February 7, Friday, February 8, and Saturday, February 9 from 4:00 P.M. to 10:00 P.M. each day. The attached tables show the volume of traffic by hour traversing each intersection highlighting the peak hour of each intersection. As shown in each table, the weekday evening peak hour is higher than the nighttime hours. Further, the Saturday volumes are lower than the weekday volumes. As such, the weekday evening peak hour analyzed in the Traffic Study represents the peak traffic conditions in the area.

71. Traffic Report page 28: As suggested above, provisions for pedestrian crosswalks are needed at the intersection of Highland and Campbell.

Response: Duly noted. These are public streets and pedestrian crosswalks are subject to the Village requirements. Petitioner will cooperate with regard to crosswalk requirements located on the Property.

72. See comments #19. The Traffic report must be updated based on the actual conditions of Highland Avenue under the Vail Garage. Provide a LOS for the intersections of Highland Avenue and the two garage ramps.

Response: The updated Traffic Study includes capacity analyses for the two ramps off Highland Avenue in the Vail garage.

73. Traffic Report page 32: The description of the Chestnut Avenue passenger/loading zones infers proprietary use of the on-street loading zone for this site's residents. However the discussion on the next page about the number of onsite passenger/loading areas make on street loading zones unnecessary. Village policy and enforcement will not support on street loading zones.

Response: The provision of the passenger loading zone on Chestnut is necessary in order to provide direct access to the building lobby that will front Chestnut.

74. Traffic Report page 36 & 37: Provide ITE backup and calculations to support the findings in tables 7 & 8.

Response: The parking analysis has been updated in the updated Traffic Study.

ARLINGTON 425 – PC#: 19-001

PETITIONER RESPONSES TO ROUND 1 COMMENTS FEBRUARY 25, 2019

RESPONSE TO FIRE DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

1. The buildings are to be fully sprinkled.

Response: Duly noted and will comply.

2. A Knox Box containing keys to access necessary parts of the building shall be at the main front entrance of the buildings and for each commercial/office space. The Fire Department will be requesting additional Knox Boxes for the buildings as plans get finalized due to the size and complexity of the project.

Response: Duly noted and will comply.

3. The Fire Department Connection shall be located at the main front entrance of the buildings, be fully visible, and accessible. It shall be located within a maximum travel distance of 100 feet to the nearest accessible fire hydrant capable of delivering the required fire flows. We also request an additional FDC be located at the southeast side of the “Highland Building” and a fire hydrant be located in the circular drive area between the three buildings.

Response: Duly noted and will comply.

4. Install a fully operational annunciator panel or alarm panel at the main front entrance door of each building.

Response: Duly noted and will comply.

ARLINGTON 425 – PC#: 19-001
PETITIONER RESPONSES TO ROUND 1 COMMENTS
FEBRUARY 25, 2019

RESPONSE TO HEALTH SERVICES DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

1. The requirements of IAC Section 233.6 Multi-story Housing apply.

Response: Duly noted and will comply.

2. All Common Use and Public Use Spaces on all floors (levels) shall be accessible in compliance with the applicable requirements of the Code per Section 233.6.1.

Response: Duly noted and will comply.

3. 20 percent of the dwelling units in each building shall be designed and constructed as either accessible or adaptable dwelling units and shall be distributed throughout each building to provide a variety of sizes and locations per IAC Section 233.6.4 in accordance with Section 812.

Response: Duly noted and will comply.

4. Petitioner shall supply a unit listing of 20% accessible/Adaptable dwelling units for each building in a variety of sizes and locations as required by IAC Section 233.6.4.

Response: Duly noted and will comply.

5. An Accessible Route into and within all adaptable dwelling units to all rooms and spaces shall provide wheelchair maneuvering clearances at all doors as required by IAC Section 233.6.5.2 in accordance with Section 404.2.4.

Response: Duly noted and will comply.

6. An accessible route per IAC Section 233.6.5.3 shall be provided into and within all private patios, terraces, balconies and garages designated for use by adaptable dwelling units.

Response: Duly noted and will comply.

7. Entrance Doors to all individual dwelling units shall provide clear floor wheelchair maneuvering space in compliance with IAC Section 404.

Response: Duly noted and will comply.

8. Identify Areas of Refuge where persons unable to use stairways can remain temporarily to

await instructions or assistance during emergency evacuation per IAC Section 506.6.

Response: Duly noted and will comply.

Sheet HL. 1 of 12 Ground Floor Parking Garage:

9. Identify the Circulation path from Accessible Parking spaces to the Elevator Lobby.

Response: See revised drawings. Required accessible parking spaces are located directly across from the elevator lobby on the 1st and 2nd floors of the garage plans.

Sheet CA. 1 of 12 Second Floor Plan:

10. Bridge - Changes in level are not permitted in the required maneuvering clearances at doors per IAC Section 494.2.4.4 and shall comply with IAC Section 302.

Response: Duly noted and will comply.

Sheet CS – “Drop Off” locations:

11. Identify Passenger Loading Zones complying with IAC Section 503 for every continuous 100 linear feet of loading zone space, or fraction thereof with markings per IAC Section 209.2.1.

Response: Constructions documents will comply and identify code-compliant IAC accessible routes for the loading zone.

12. Identify the accessible route via curb ramp or other means adjoining the passenger loading zone with the sidewalk per IAC Section 503.3.

Response: Constructions documents will comply and identify code-compliant IAC accessible routes for the loading zone, as required.

Federal Fair Housing Accessibility Requirements:

13. **Important Note:** In elevator buildings all public and common use areas and 100 percent of the dwelling units are covered by the Federal Fair Housing Accessibility Guidelines (See Fair Housing Amendments Act, 42 U.S.C. §3601 et seq.)

The ten “Safe Harbor” Equivalents detailing the 7-Requirements of Accessibility
<https://www.fairhousingfirst.org/faq/safeharbors.html>

Requirement 1. Accessible building entrance on an accessible route.

Requirement 2. Accessible and usable public and common use areas.

Requirement 3. Usable doors.

Requirement 4. Accessible route into and through the covered dwelling unit.

Requirement 5. Light switches, electrical outlets, thermostats and other environmental controls in accessible locations.

Requirement 6. Reinforced walls for grab bars.

Requirement 7. Usable kitchens and bathrooms.

Response: Duly noted and will comply.

ARLINGTON 425 – PC#: 19-001
PETITIONER RESPONSES TO ROUND 1 COMMENTS
FEBRUARY 25, 2019

**RESPONSE TO PLANNING & COMMUNITY
DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT COMMENTS**

- 1-6. No response required. Part of Planning & Community Development Department form.
7. The Plan Commission must review and approve the following actions:
- a) Planned Unit Development to allow a 361 unit mixed use development.
 - b) Rezoning from the R-3, One-Family Dwelling District to the B-5, Downtown District, for four lots of the subject property.
 - c) Preliminary Plat of Subdivision to consolidate the subject property into one lot.
 - d) Land Use Variation to allow residential uses as a principal use in the B-5 District (Chestnut building).
 - e) Variation to chapter 28, Section 5.1-14.4, Conditions of Use, to allow dwelling units below the second floor (Chestnut building)
 - f) Variation to Chapter 28, Section 5.1-14.2, Required Minimum Yards, to allow a 7' setback along a public street frontage (Chestnut Street) for the Campbell building where code requires a 20' setback.
 - g) Variation to Chapter 28, Section 5.1-14.2, Required Minimum Yards, to allow a 12.3' setback along a public street frontage (Chestnut Street) for the chestnut building where code requires a 20' setback.
 - h) Variation to Chapter 28, Section 5.1-14.2, Required Minimum Yards, to allow a 12.4' setback along an interior lot line (southern lot line) for the Highland building where code requires a 25' setback.
 - i) Chapter 28, Section 10.2-7, Size, to allow certain parking spaces within the Highland building garage to be 15' in depth where code requires 18' in depth.
 - j) A variation may be required for the proposed pergola.
 - k) Chapter 29, Section 29-304(l), to allow a 50' wide right-of-way for a local street where code requires a 66' wide right-of-way for local streets, along certain portions of Highland Avenue.

Response: Duly noted. Due to the size and location of the emergency stairwells, there will be approximately 10 parking spaces which are 15'-4" deep in lieu of 18'-0" deep, which can be used for motorcycles or compact cars. These 10 parking spaces are among the 80+ parking spaces above the code requirements for all residential and commercial uses throughout the development. The proposed courtyard pergola has been removed in order to provide the required fire lane. Petitioner also notes that the setback along Chestnut Avenue is 12.23', and the setback along the south end of Highland Avenue is 12.9'.

8. Please ensure that all plans and/or studies to be resubmitted as a result of the Round 1 Department review comments include a revision date. Additionally, all revised plans must incorporate any changes as recommended by the Design Commission.

Response: Duly noted and will comply.

9. Will any Bylaws or Covenants be established for the proposed development? Please provide these (in draft form) if so. How will shared parking and cross access be governed if individual buildings are taxed parceled off and sold to separate owners? Will easements be dedicated?

Response: Not at this time. The current plan is to have one owner. If the buildings have separate ownership in the future, there will be a Declaration of Easements, Covenants and Restrictions addressing these issues.

10. Impact Fees will be required for the residential portion of the development, in accordance with Village Code.

Response: Duly noted

11. Please revise the project narrative to provide information on any green features/ sustainable design elements that are proposed (other than the green roofs).

Response: Included in the revised project narrative.

12. A photometric plan is required.

Response: Photometric lighting diagrams and associated catalog cuts for all roadway, parking lot, and building mounted luminaires will be prepared during design development phase and will be submitted to the Village at that time. Please note that all future restaurants will be required to receive a Special Use Permit or will be required to obtain a Special Use Permit Waiver, if eligible.

13. Based on communications with the Engineering Division and the Fire Safety Division, brick pavers are potentially viable for a fire lane, but must be supported by a structural engineer review that certifies the brick paver pavement design will meet the AASHTO HS-25 loading and also the punch through loading from the tower truck outriggers.

Response: Documentation to be provided for staff review and acceptance for brick pavers in fire lanes.

14. Section 9.8(i) of the zoning Code requires that all PUD's include a preliminary construction schedule and phasing plan. Please provide the required preliminary construction schedule, which includes information on the approximate date of construction start, the number of construction phases and the starting and completion date for each phase, and details on what will be constructed in each phase, as well as a construction staging plan. The construction phasing plan shall include the anticipated number of construction workers and where they will park during each phase of construction, the type and amount of construction vehicles per

phase and whereby will be staged, the location of material storage, and information on anticipated lane closures, including info on where the closures will take place and the general timeframe for each closure. Please note that the project narrative includes a general description of the construction phases, with phase one involving the construction of the “Highland building, Campbell building, and infrastructure and common areas”, and phase two involving the construction of the underground garage for the Chestnut building. Please clarify if construction of the common areas involves the courtyard landscaping, fire lane, and associated improvements within the courtyard area. If so, it is assumed that the construction of the underground garage for the Chestnut building will involve the removal of the previously constructed elements within the courtyard and will then involve their replacement. Please address this situation and confirm with the Fire Safety Division if temporary removal of the fire lane will be permitted.

Response: This comment requires several responses.

(a) As noted in a part of Staff’s own comment above, the project consists of 2 Phases. Phase I includes the “Highland building, Campbell building, and infrastructure and common areas”. Phase II includes the Chestnut building and the underground garage for that building.

(b) No preliminary construction schedule has yet been created as no approvals have been obtained, no design development drawings have been completed, and therefore no financing or equity funding can be obtained. Petitioner currently plans to commence construction of Phase I in the spring/summer of 2020. However, there can be no exact time commitment when actual construction will commence. It is also currently anticipated that the construction of Phase I will take approximately 24 months to complete.

(c) Power Construction has submitted a Phase I site staging and logistics plan detailing the following:

- (i) construction staging;
- (ii) construction trailers;
- (iii) location of contractor parking;
- (iv) construction fencing;
- (v) crane roads;
- (vi) emergency muster points

(d) Petitioner is currently studying the construction of the Chestnut garage under the courtyard fire lane, understanding that there must be a code compliant fire lane access at all times between the Highland and Chestnut buildings.

(e) Other portions of this question will be addressed as Petitioner develops its final plans.

15. Please provide a response to the criteria outlined in Section 9.5 of the zoning code relative to variation approval standards for variations associated with a PUD.

Response: This will be further addressed as a part of Petitioner's submission of revised Plan and these responses.

16. Please be aware that the PUD will be reviewed in relation to the criteria contained in Section 9.10 of the Zoning code. An analysis demonstrating the economic benefits of this project shall be required.

Response: Included in the Petitioner's submission of the revised plans and these responses to Staff comments.

17. For any new variations identified in these review comments, please provide a written response to the hardship criteria for variation approval, as outlined on page 2B of the zoning application and summarized below:

Variations and Land Use Variations:

- The proposed use will not alter the essential character of the locality and will be compatible with existing uses and zoning of nearby property; and
- The plight of the owner is due to unique circumstances, which may include the length of time the subject property has been vacant as zoned; and
- The proposed variation is in harmony with the spirit and intent of this Chapter; and
- The variance requested is the minimum variance necessary to allow reasonable use of the property.

Response: It does not appear that any additional variances are required.

Site Plan Related:

18. The site plan must be redesigned to accommodate for the fire lane concerns from the Fire Safety Division.

Response: Revised Site Plan includes the accommodation of the fire lane.

19. Please include the necessary zoning analysis on the site plans, as attached to the end of these review comments. All missing information within the tables must be filled out.

Response: Attached.

20. Please revise the site plan to accommodate for the potential future conversion of the one-way drive aisle from Highland Avenue to the internal courtyard to a two-way drive aisle (which would be added on the northern side of this drive aisle and may need the screen wall of the loading area to be shifted slightly to the north).

Response: Based on neighborhood discussions and feedback, as well as communications from Village Trustees, minimizing traffic on Highland Avenue was

preferred. The required fire lane will be provided when brick paver documentation is accepted, and no widening of this drive aisle will be required. There is no intention to convert this access point to a two-way driveway.

21. The project narrative states that the southern setback of the Highland building will be 12.9', however, the engineering plans show a 12.4' setback. Please clarify and revise the plans accordingly.

Response: The updated Site Plan clarifies this inconsistency

22. Please provide an elevation of the proposed retaining wall along the southern property line, as well as details on the retaining wall (color, materials, etc.).

Response: Final details will be provided as part of the CDs, as Petitioner has been asked to minimize the height of this grade wall. The exposed portions of the grade wall will have a masonry face to match the stone base of the Chestnut Building.

23. The ramp wall for the Chestnut garage appears to encroach on a visibility triangle. Please show all visibility triangles on the plans and propose a solution to the visibility issue for cars exiting the Chestnut garage ramp.

Response: Visibility triangle diagrams are included in the updated Traffic Study.

24. Please evaluate alternative locations for the loading zones within the Highland building that would allow the preservation of parking spaces along Highland and would not interfere with traffic along Highland. One option could be a loading zone along the drive aisle (similar to the loading zone along the west side of the 200 W. Campbell building). Or perhaps the loading zones in that building could be moved south to be combined with the drive aisle entrance / exit to the garage.

Response: Due to the location of the 240' long Village parking garage, which is on the property line, it is necessary to provide a curb cut into the Highland garage (and building) at certain locations. These loading docks will provide necessary services for the project's buildings. Also, due to existing structural components of the Village garage, access points to Petitioner's property are very limited.

25. Please evaluate the on-street parking spaces on the east and west side of the porte-cochere entrance/exit of the Campbell building. The spaces on each side of the entrance / exit may not be viable to allow for suitable room and visibility for turns in / out of the porte-cochere.

Response: Visibility triangle diagrams are included in the updated Traffic Study which indicates that all parking spaces on the south side of Campbell will need to be eliminated as a result of the visibility study contained in the updated Traffic Study. It should be noted that if all downtown buildings were required to observe similar visibility requirements, most on-street parking in the downtown would be eliminated.

26. Please revise the plans to provide details on the proposed fence along the southern property

line and in front of the Chestnut building (height, style, materials, etc.)

Response: The plan will be to provide a 42-inch ornamental metal fence in a design submitted at permitting and in black color.

27. Please revise the plans to include details of the proposed pergola at the southern end of the property. Additionally, please note that pergolas are considered accessory structures, and as such must be located in a rear yard only (i.e. completely behind the rear of the building). Pergolas are also restricted to 300 square feet in size, 15' in height, and must be setback 5' from a rear lot line. Please clarify if a variation is requested and provide the necessary written justification for any such variation.

Response: The pergola has been removed to provide for the required fire lane.

28. Please revise the plans to provide additional details on the proposed fireplace at the rear of the property (setback, size, height, open fire pit? Fireplace with chimney? Outdoor grilling station?).

Response: The fireplace has been removed to provide for the required fire lane.

29. Please provide a detailed explanation of all utility relocations that will be necessary to facilitate this development, outlining which lines will be removed, what utilities are on those lines, and where those utilities will be re-routed. Will any new lines / poles or changes to existing lines / poles be needed to facilitate the utility removal? Will any upgrades to the utilities be required to accommodate for the proposed development? Please provide an update on all communications with utility companies regarding the ability of existing utilities in the area to accommodate for the proposed development and any upgrades that may be required.

Response: It is not possible to provide a detailed explanation of utility relocations at the present time as they have not yet been determined. The overhead utility lines running north-south and east-west will be removed, and if necessary, relocated as required by the affected utility company (ies). Meetings have been held with ComEd and NICOR and each are preparing service plans. Both have been notified of the pending Chestnut Street work scheduled for the summer of 2019.

30. As previously requested, please provide a separate exhibit that shows all building mounted, ground mounted, and interior utilities, switch gear, generators, meters, transformers, pedestals, and other mechanical equipment. For all exterior equipment, the exhibit should address how these items will be screened. The Plans should also include preliminary information on expected locations / routing of gas lines, electric lines, cable lines, etc. It is understood that this plan will be conceptual and that final placements may need revisions as more detailed plans are developed.

Response: At this time, on a project of this size, it is impossible to know all of the utility connections, locations and details necessary for the public services. Petitioner will work with staff to properly shield and screen all utilities structures as required by code once they are known. Some gas meter and transformer locations have been

indicated on the updated Site Plan, and screening shown on the updated Landscaping Plans, as possible locations.

31. Please provide details of any preliminary structural review of the Vail Avenue garage and the ability to construct the Highland building adjacent to the garage. Will any improvements to the garage be needed? Do the proposed access points to the Highland building (loading spaces, garage entrance / exit) conflict with any structural elements of the garage?

Response: We do not foresee any excessive architectural detailing or structural modifications at this time. Final drawings for construction will include all necessary structural detailing, and Petitioner will work with staff to ensure compatibility and integrity of the Vail garage. The Vail garage panels are all connected with weld plates at the interior, and can be accessed easily from within. Walker Consultants is a part of Petitioner's team, and they were the designers of the Vail garage.

Building Related:

32. Clarify if the rooftop restaurant is proposed at this time. The plans do not currently show this restaurant however, the traffic and parking study has taken into account a restaurant within the amenity space. Will this restaurant be 2,500 sq. ft.? The plans should be revised to show this space if approval is being sought. A condition of approval may be recommended that would restrict the rooftop area from operating as a bar only (i.e. if liquor is to be served, the space would be required to have a full kitchen).

Response: The Highland Building roof top will serve as the development's amenity center. The space includes a fitness center, lockers, outdoor decks with lounge seating, fireplaces, business center, conference room, and an internet lounge. The goal is to attract a restaurant with full kitchen, maybe a limited menu, and full service bar area of approximately 2,500 square feet. Once an operator is found that believes that a full-service restaurant is viable at this location, ownership will formalize a plan. If unsuccessful, it will be used to expand the project amenity space.

33. For each building, please provide a detailed explanation of how trash collection will function. Where will pick-up locations be? If collection will occur on the outside of a building, where will the dumpsters be stored on collection day? What time of day will trash collection likely occur? How many days a week will trash collection be needed?

Response: Each building has internal trash and recycling collection rooms. The Highland and Campbell pick up will be in the loading areas per the plans, and Chestnut pickup will be at the bottom of the garage ramp. Time and number of pickups will be controlled by the property management company and applicable service contractors.

34. For each building, please provide a detailed explanation outlining loading / drop-offs, deliveries (commercial and residential), and move-ins / move-outs. Where will each of these functions occur? Will there be any restrictions on times / days for such operations? Will there be an onsite doorman for residential deliveries?

Response: Building move-ins and move-outs will be controlled by the property management company. Campbell and Highland Buildings have dedicated loading areas, and Chestnut will have a loading area in the courtyard by the northeast entry. Appropriate resident and commercial tenant rules and regulations will be developed for these purposes. Petitioner is planning for consolidated package drop off facilities in the Highland and/or Campbell Building. Please provide a basement floorplan for the Highland building / garage and Campbell Building.

Response: Additional basement drawings have been provided in the updated plans.

35. Please provide a breakdown of the square footage of each floor for each building (including basements).

Response: Square footage breakdown for each floor were included as a part of Petitioner's application.

36. Please provide a typical unit layout for each unit type.

Response: At this time, typical floor plan unit mixes have been provided. Full unit layouts will be provided as part of the CDs.

37. Please dimension all parking spaces (width and depth) and provide drive aisle dimensions for both the Highland building and Chestnut building garages. Additionally, please dimension all exterior loading spaces and drop-off spaces.

Response: Interior parking garage stall dimensions are included in the revised Plans. Civil Engineering drawings dimension all exterior loading spaces as requested.

38. How will the 6th Floor roof on the Highland building be used? Will this roof be accessible to residents? Some elevations show trees on this roof; please clarify and provide details on the floor plans.

Response: At the present time Petitioner's intent is that this will be a "green roof", accessible to tenants of the building for additional seasonal outdoor space, and serve to enhance on-site storm water management.

39. Building sections should include the underground connection between the Highland building and Campbell building.

Response: Architectural drawings have been revised to show the underground connection as requested.

40. Please confirm that the height of the Highland building as shown on the elevations was measured per the definition of "Building Height" within the Zoning Code.

Response: The Highland building is currently shown as a maximum 140'-0" which is measured from the main drive aisle entry, to the top of the roof parapet.

41. Please confirm that the balconies on the northern elevation of the Campbell building will not encroach over the property line and into the public way. If so, an indemnification agreement with the Village will be required. Additionally, please confirm that all balconies will be constructed of a suitable material to allow for BBQ grills.

Response: Petitioner has not reviewed the dimensioned balconies and whether they encroach over the property line into the right-of-way. If they do, Petitioner will execute the requested indemnification agreement. Petitioner confirms that all balconies will be constructed of a suitable material to allow for BBQ grills.

42. Please confirm that the Highland building loading spaces will have 14' of vertical clearance.

Response: Confirmed.

43. Please revise the plans to include details on the screening walls for the loading zones of the Campbell building (height, material, etc.).

Response: Landscape screening has been provided

44. Please revise the floor plans to provide details on the amenity space within the Highland building. Will this space include a fitness room? Meeting rooms? Business center? Clubroom / lounge room with a kitchen?

Response: Final amenity space allocations have not yet been determined, but will be included in final CDs, and Petitioner's intent remains to provide all of the stated amenities in some fashion.

Market Study:

45. Previous correspondence indicated that the Chestnut building could potentially be developed as a condominium, however, the market study does not support a condominium development of a size as proposed in the Chestnut building. Please confirm that this building will be developed as rental and acknowledge that conversion to a condominium would require an amendment to the PUD and would need to be justified by a market study.

Response: Ownership is developing the Chestnut Building as a residential structure with no commercial areas and with underground parking. Subject to market conditions, ownership will decide the type of residential use to best fit for the village and ownership. Ownership has a long history of developing residential and mixed use developments and will decide at that time which is best for a successful development.

46. The market study states that storage lockers are a necessary feature in class A rental developments. No storage lockers were shown on the floor plans. Please confirm that each unit in the development will have a storage locker and outline the locations of such lockers on the floorplans.

Response: Storage will be provided; final locations have not yet been determined, but will be included in final CDs.

47. The market study suggests that the development include an outdoor pool, which is a desired amenity in class A rental developments such as the Arlington 425 proposal. Please address the lack of swimming pool within the plan.

Response: While the Market Study Consultant believes that a swimming pool would enhance the market appeal of the property, they have also advised Petitioner that is not critical to the success of the development. Comparable projects such as One Arlington have been able to target the luxury renter without providing a swimming pool amenity.

48. The market study identified some concern over the large size of many of the units and a concern that their large size may affect the ability to achieve the desired price point per square foot. Please address this situation.

Response: Unit sizes have been adjusted and are included in the current Plans.

Plat of Subdivision:

49. Dedication of land along Highland Avenue is required per the regulations of Chapter 29 of the Municipal Code and therefore a variation will be necessary to waive this requirement. The Village is currently evaluating whether the dedication of 8' of land is necessary along Highland Avenue where the subject property does not abut the Vail Avenue garage. If this dedication is required, it must be shown on the Plat.

Response: Per our meeting with staff on February 6, 2019, the 8' dedication along Highland will be required north and south of the existing Vail Street parking garage. The Site Plan has been updated to reflect compliance with this requirement.

50. An easement for the sidewalk along the east side of the Campbell building may be necessary if 8' of land is **not** dedicated along that side of the site.

Response: No longer applicable; see response to Question #50 above.

51. The required building setbacks must be shown on the Plat (20' along the Chestnut Avenue property line as measured from the east side of the dedicated area and 25' along the southern property line).

Response: The proposed Plat has been revised to show the required building setbacks.

52. Please check with the Engineering Division to determine if easements will be required along the east, west, and southern property lines per Section 29-309 of Chapter 29.

Response: The Engineering Department Comments did not include a comment requiring easements along the east, west, and southern property lines.

Parking and Traffic:

53. The floor plans did not include the breakdown of square footage for restaurant space within the development.

(a) Please confirm that the numbers within the KLOA study represent the breakdown of total uses, and provide details on which floor each portion of the square footage for retail, office, and restaurant are located. The floor plans should also be adjusted to make this clear.

Response: The Traffic Study does not include this breakdown, but includes an estimate of space sizes and uses provided by Petitioner. At this point it is impossible to determine which portion of each floor will be used for retail, restaurants and office. However, Petitioner believes that in the Campbell building, the west ground floor space will include primarily service retail or office users, and the east ground floor is projected to be primarily restaurants and/or specialty retail.

(b) Additionally, is 2nd floor retail space viable? It seems more likely that any retail space on the 2nd floor would be used as office as opposed to retail.

Response: Petitioner believes that the second floor space is viable for a second floor commercial use, whether it be the second floor of a restaurant on the east, and/or other commercially allowed uses in the B-5 zoning district.

(c) If retail is proposed on the 2nd floor, please clarify how this will be viable.

Response: It would be viable a larger gatherings such as private parties and meetings, or large banquets or parties. Restauranters today look for private meeting and dining areas for large and small gatherings. During busy times it can also be used as additional customer dining space.

(d) Finally, please note that the KLOA study lists the size of the retail space within the Highland building at 2,000 sq. ft. and the floorplans show this space as 3,023 sq. ft.

Response: The loading berth for the Highland building has been revised. Retail space square footage now equals 2,869 sq. ft.

54. As previously mentioned, the downtown area may have a second evening peak in traffic, which occurs later than the 5:00 pm-6:00 pm peak identified in the KLOA study. The study did not contain any analysis of whether there is a second evening peak beyond the 5:00pm-6:00pm time. Please address this.

Response: Please see response to Engineering Department comment #70.

55. The traffic volumes during peak times do not show a need for two-lane egress along Campbell. Please revise to one lane of egress or clarify why two separate egress lanes have been provided.

Response: Plans have been revised to provide one lane of egress onto Campbell Street.

56. The traffic distribution shows low volumes of ingress traffic utilizing the Campbell Street entrance during peak times, and the vast majority of traffic exiting the site through this point during peak times is projected to loop back down to Sigwalt via Chestnut or Highland. One of the primary reasons for the Campbell Street access was to keep traffic off Chestnut and Highland, but the models do not show this occurring. Please address this situation.

Response: The modified traffic distribution is included in the updated Traffic Study.

57. The traffic volumes from Figure 7 of the KLOA study, when added to the volumes in Figure 8, do not equate to the volumes shown in Figure 9. Please revise these figures to model the correct traffic volumes.

Response: The volume figures have been revised and are included in the updated Traffic Study. It is important to note that the capacity analyses used the correct traffic volumes.

58. The parking study should be revised to include a parking analysis showing the residential uses parked at 1.5 spaces per unit, but the commercial / office / retail spaces parked per the 2018 Rich & Associates parking study of downtown parking demand (see below):

Classification	Peak Hour Daytime Value (1:00 pm – 2:00 pm)	Peak Hour Evening Value (7:00 pm – 8:00 pm)
Retail (per 1,000 sq. ft.)	1.32	0.72
Office (per 1,000 sq. ft.)	1.62	0.23
Restaurant (per 1,000 sq. ft.)	3.61	10.82
Metropolis Theater (per seat)	0.13	0.32
Residential (per dwelling unit)	0.60	1.82
Movie Theater (per seat)	0.09	0.17
Banquet Hall (per attendee)	.012	0.60
Commuters	0.95	0.17

Response: The shared parking analyses in the updated Traffic Study includes three scenarios: 1) based entirely on Village Code requirements, 2) based entirely on parking demand data provided by ITE, and 3) using the Village Code for residential and ITE for all other proposed land uses. The results show that the proposed development parking

supply exceeds Village Code by 6 parking spaces and exceeds ITE requirements by 56 parking spaces. The shared parking analyses under the third scenario shows a parking deficit of 10 parking spaces.

59. The traffic volumes from Figure 7y show that much of the traffic leaving the site will travel through the Campbell Street access point, with the majority of it ending up taking a right to loop south on Highland Avenue. Why wouldn't these cars instead take a more direct route of leaving the Highland building garage exit directly on Highland Avenue assuming that many of them are residents and have access to the egress point on Highland? What percentage of these trips are resident based vs. commercial / office / restaurant based?

Response: The updated Traffic Study includes an analysis of the intersections of Highland with Campbell and Sigwalt under two-way and all-way stop sign control.

60. Please clarify why the value at 6:00am in Table 7 for residential parking demand is 443 spaces ($307 \times 1.5 = 461$ spaces).

Response: An updated parking analysis is included in the updated Traffic Study.

61. Please note that the Village is still evaluating the need for stop controls at Campbell / Highland, Chestnut / Campbell, Chestnut / Sigwalt, and Highland / Sigwalt.

Response: The Traffic Study has been updated to include an analysis of the intersections of Highland with Campbell and Sigwalt under two-way and all-way stop sign control.

62. The KLOA study should distinguish between residential traffic and commercial / office / restaurant traffic.

Response: The Traffic Study has been updated to include separate traffic assignments for the residential and non-residential uses.

63. Given the reduction of on-street parking spaces along Campbell and Highland, combined with the increased demand for on-street parking spaces that will be created by the proposed retail / restaurant / office uses, please evaluate the possibility of opening up limited spaces within the development open for public parking.

Response: Until the entire project is completed and stabilized, it is not possible to evaluate the possibility of opening up the spaces within the Highland Building garage for public use. The garage will be controlled access.

64. Please provide a detailed explanation outlining how parking within the Highland Avenue garage will function for the commercial / office uses? How many spaces will be used for commercial / office uses? Where will they be located? How will access be restricted? How will customer parking be identified and assigned? How will employee parking be identified and assigned?

Response: The Highland Building garage design is to serve both the residential and commercial users. Petitioner has engaged Walker Parking Consultants to devise a plan for how and where the residential and commercial spaces will be accessed, located and paid for. It is currently contemplated that the upper floors of the garage will be used for the tenants and the lower floors for commercial user parking.

65. Please provide a detailed explanation for how parking for the residential units will be assigned. Will each unit have an assigned space, or will residential parking operate on a first come first served basis? Please note that the Rich & Associates 2018 parking study recommended that residential parking spaces are not assigned to specific units (i.e. they are unbundled). How will access to these residential only spaces be restricted? How many will there be and where will they be located?

Response: The residential spaces will be separately accessed and located on the upper levels. Although they will be numbered, it is not currently contemplated that they will be assigned. However, based on further consultation with the parking consultants, property management, and tenant demand, this could change.

66. The number of parking spaces shown on the Highland building section drawings do not add up to the 454 number contained within the project narrative. Please revise and clarify if the 15' deep parking spaces were included in the overall parking stall count.

Response: Ten 15'-4" parking spaces are included at this time that will accommodate compact cars and motorcycles. The correct parking count of 460 parking spaces, which include the aforementioned 10 parking spaces, are reflected on the revised plans, Zoning Matrix, and "Arlington 425 Unit Mix and Parking" documentation.

67. Recent changes to the IAC allow abutting handicap accessible parking spaces to share an access aisle. You are encouraged to take advantage of this provision, which would allow you to increase the parking stall count. In addition, please clarify the locations of all handicap parking spaces. It appears that the Highland building has only 5 handicap parking spaces where 9 would be required.

Response: Revised Plans indicate current IAC shared handicap access aisles. The second floor garage plan was not included in the drawing set, but includes the remaining 4 required handicap parking spaces.

68. Please confirm that all proposed office uses will be general office and not medical office uses. Due to the higher parking demand generated by medical office uses, a condition of approval limiting these spaces to general office is likely.

Response: The second floor will be split with general offices on the west side and either second floor spaces for the ground floor retailers or general office. If there are potential medical or dental users, Petitioner acknowledges that conditional approval will be required.

69. The floorplans should include a note outlining how many bicycle parking spaces will be

included within the Highland building. Will these spaces be available to the residents of each building, as well as the commercial / office tenants and the public? The streetscape improvements along Campbell should also include some sidewalk bicycle parking spaces.

Response: A generous bicycle parking area is shown on the first floor of the Highland building. Additional resident bicycle storage facilities will be provided within the basement of the Campbell building. Additional bicycle parking will be provided and coordinated with staff.

70. The number of required loading spaces will be determined once the square footage of each floor has been provided. A variation may be required.

Response: It is our understanding that code requires one 10' x 35' loading berth per building, with which Petitioner shall comply with. Additional off-street drop-off and pick-up areas are provided per the plan.

71. The parking study should be revised to include a parking analysis showing the residential uses parked at 1.5 spaces per unit, but the office / restaurant / retail spaces parked per the ITE parking generation rates. The text on page 36 is misleading and states that "Using ITE parking rates and hourly distributions, a shared parking analysis was conducted under two scenarios". However, it appears that the scenario in Table 7 assigns office / restaurant / retail demand per Village Code requirements and does not use ITE generation rates.

Response: See response to Planning & Community Development Department comment #60.

ARLINGTON 425 – PC#: 19-001
PETITIONER RESPONSES TO ROUND 1 COMMENTS
FEBRUARY 25, 2019

RESPONSE TO LANDSCAPING COMMENTS

1. Provide additional foundation plantings along Highland and Campbell.

Response: Moveable planters will be provided to allow for outdoor dining space.

2. Provide a detail of the proposed fence and retaining wall along the south property line.

Response: Details for fence/wall on the south property line to be provided and resolved during the final planning process.

3. Along the south elevation of 44 S. Highland incorporate ornamental trees and shrubs in order to soften the large span of wall. In addition, provide shade trees on the north elevation of 44 S. Highland.

Response: Plans have been revised to provide additional plant material. Please note that vines are proposed to grow on the building façade.

4. On the landscape plan, indicate the location of the below grade parking and the outline of the detention area.

Response: Plan revised to indicate below grade parking and detention areas.

5. Provide additional screening adjacent to the transformer that is located south of 225 W. Campbell Street. In addition, provide a utility plan that identifies all mechanical units that are located at grade and indicate how they will be screened.

Response: Plans revised to add screening. See revised Engineering Plans for preliminary utility plan.

6. In order to soften the mass of the proposed building at 33 S. Chestnut, incorporate ornamental trees along the west elevation.

Response: Plans revised to add ornamental trees.

7. Provide a site furnishings package. It is recommended that large free standing planters be provided on the private property along Campbell and Highland.

Response: Site furnishings package will be provided later. Freestanding planters

added to private property at Highland and Campbell.

8. Along Campbell and Highland incorporate bump outs at the corners and adjacent to each drive aisle.

Response: Bump outs not currently shown on Campbell and Highland corners and drive aisles.

9. Along Campbell and Highland there is a large span of brick pavers between the back of curb and the proposed building. It is recommended that the area be further evaluated and that raised planters similar to the planters along Harmony Park be incorporated. In addition, it is recommended that the space at the corner be evaluated. This is a focal point and the space should be further developed.

Response: Plans revised to include moveable planters at foundation and planters at the Highland and Campbell intersection. Landscape Architect to confirm preference of tree grates or planters on Campbell and Highland.

10. Provide landscaping adjacent to the screen wall for the loading area that is located south of 225 S. Campbell near Highland.

Response: Plans have been revised to add screening.

11. The streetscape along Campbell and Highland must be consistent with the Downtown details/streetscape.

Response: Duly noted.

12. As more detailed plans are provided additional comments may be forthcoming.

Response: Duly noted.

13. Provide an interim landscape plan for each phase.

Response: Interim landscape plan will be provided.

ARLINGTON 425 – PC#: 19-001

PETITIONER RESPONSES TO ROUND 1 COMMENTS

FEBRUARY 25, 2019

RESPONSE TO POLICE DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

1. Character of use:

The character of use is consistent with the area. It will be necessary to limit access to the grounds, especially the pergola I firepit I courtyard- is this for residents only and does it have controlled access? This is recommended to limit access and loitering. The addition of Trespass signs is recommended.

Response: In order to provide the required fire lane, the pergola and fire pit areas will be removed from the courtyard. Proper signage will be installed and coordinated with the proper use of the courtyard.

2. Are lighting requirements adequate?

Lighting should be up to Village of Arlington Heights Code. Special attention should be given to those outside common areas- i.e. courtyard and parking garage. Landscaping must not create hiding locations and should provide for natural surveillance.

Response: Duly noted and will comply.

3. Present traffic problems?

There is not enough parking in the downtown area. Is the parking garage open to the public? If not, is there access control to restrict non-residents/non-permitted driver's access? Our Traffic Bureau has a number of concerns regarding parking enforcement, traffic patterns and other issues. The blue prints and Traffic Study have been forwarded by the Community Services Bureau to the Traffic Bureau for review.

Response: Access to the parking garage will be controlled and restricted, and not open to the public. The petitioner will work with staff to coordinate proper security and accessibility as required.

4. Traffic accidents at particular location?

This is not a problem area in relation to traffic accidents.

Response: Duly noted.

5. Traffic problems that may be created by the development.

-The area around the vehicle entrance/exit should be clear of obstructions. Vehicle traffic entering and exiting the available covered parking must be able to view other vehicles and pedestrians. Street parking adjacent to the entrances/exits should be prohibited. Warning lights/audible signals could be used to signal that vehicles are exiting.

-Although the Traffic Study indicated no need for a stop sign at Highland and Sigwalt, the Police Department has concerns about the traffic flow at Highland and Sigwalt and the need of a four way stop sign at that intersection.

Response: Duly noted and agree.

6. General comments:

a. Is 225 W Campbell two separate buildings attached by a façade? If so, this will create issues for emergency response for police and fire- the buildings should have different addresses.

Response: 225 Campbell is one building. One side will have the stretcher-sized elevator, and all will be coordinated as a part of the CDs. This elevator will access all parts of the building, including the roof. Appropriate signage will identify emergency access.

b. Regarding the parking garage pedestrian bridge, who has access to this bridge? If it is not a resident only access, we foresee issues with our homeless population seeking shelter in this area.

Response: The pedestrian bridge was a part of a previous plan and was removed from the project. The current plans reflect no bridge. Instead, we have planned an underground tunnel that will have controlled access

c. Is the existing parking garage and the new parking garage both going to have public access to entrances off of Highland? If so, will the two parking garages have clearly marked addresses delineating the two in the case of an emergency when a citizen is requesting assistance from 911?

Response: The new parking garage will have a resident-only access from Highland. Proper signage will be clearly marked indicating street address per staff.

d. Is the new parking garage going to have public access or is it a resident only parking garage?

Response: The new parking garage will have public access for retail and visitors.

e. Is the new parking garage designed in a way to reduce or eliminate members of our homeless population squatting there?

Response: The garage will be monitored by cameras as well as security personnel. There will also be a full-time on-site property manager for the project

- f. Who owns the parking garage? Privately owned or Village Owned?

Response: Privately owned

- g. Please ensure that there is an emergency information/contact card on file with the Arlington Heights Police Department and that it is up-to-date. Agent contact information must be provided to the Arlington Heights Police Department during all construction phases. The form is attached. Please complete and return. This allows police department personnel to contact an agent during emergency situations or for suspicious/criminal activity on the property during all hours.

Response: Duly noted and will comply

- h. Parking could become an issue if a larger percentage of residents than expected have vehicles. Emergency telephones should be installed in the parking area for added safety.

Response: Duly noted and will comply

- i. The storage area, lower level, should be secure and accessible only to residents. There should be signage to encourage users to lock their storage lockers and video surveillance of the area to deter theft and help identify potential offenders.

Response: Duly noted and will comply.

ARLINGTON 425 – PC#: 19-001
PETITIONER RESPONSES TO ROUND 1 COMMENTS
FEBRUARY 25, 2019

RESPONSE TO PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

1. It appears that 225 S .Campbell will be supplied by water and serviced by sewer in one location, verify this is the case.

Response: The 225 W. Campbell building is a continuous building above the ground level. At this time, a single water and sanitary sewer service to this building is anticipated.

2. The 4" water service on the west side of Highland is actually a 6" line and assumed to be abandoned.

Response: This has been revised on the preliminary utility plan.

3. The proposed hydrant relocation on the north side of the existing parking garage (Highland) must be relocated further from the parking garage (perhaps north of entry apron).

Response: This has been revised on the preliminary utility plan.

4. The watermain on Chestnut is assumed to be a 6" watermain.

Response: This is consistent with the preliminary utility plan.

5. Submit details for the underground detention basin and restricted outfall.

Response: The final details for the Highland Ave. building including the details of the underground detention vault will be included in the Final Architectural plans for the building. Per Engineering Department Response #6, the outlet control structure detail is included on the preliminary utility plan (Sheet 5).

6. Submit a maintenance plan for the underground detention basin and restricted outfall.

Response: The requested maintenance plan for the stormwater management system will be included as part of the Schedule R and Exhibit R documents from the MWRDGC WMO permit for the project.

7. The Village has an underground conduit for fiber optic and copper cable (communications). It is located within the east parkway of Chestnut between the sidewalk and curb. This must be reflected in the survey.

Response: These lines will be added to the final engineering plans for the project.

8. The connection to the existing (abandoned) combined/storm sewer must verify or complete the proper abandonment/plugging to the north.

Response: This will be noted on the final engineering plans for the project.

9. The Village needs structural review and field verification of the existing Vail Garage footings to be included in design of Highland Building.

Response: The Vail garage plans provided by the Village suggest that footings do not encroach onto Petitioner's property. Petitioner has requested as-builts but whether this condition holds true will have to be field verified after final CDs are approved and may result in a field change. In the event of an encroachment appropriate notice will be given and Petitioner will work with the Village for appropriate resolution of the situation from a design, construction and legal indemnification standpoint.

10. The Village needs plans and structural approval of all modifications needed to existing garage. It appears that changes are needed to accommodate the loading bays and south entrance onto Highland.

Response: See Response 9.

11. All downspouts need to tie into proposed detention basin to reduce surcharge experienced during extreme rain events.

Response: All of the proposed internal roof drains and downspouts from the proposed buildings will tie into the proposed detention vault located under the Highland Ave. Building. Overflow downspouts will operate as overflow only and will not dump onto the public way.

Attached table to Comment #70 of the Engineering Department Comments

Time	Campbell/ Chestnut	Campbell/ Highland	Campbell/ Vail	Sigwalt/ Highland	Total
4:00 PM	342	338	554	358	1592
5:00 PM	471	502	773	449	2195
6:00 PM	361	439	712	386	1898
7:00 PM	244	310	568	286	1408
8:00 PM	161	187	326	180	854
9:00 PM	130	178	253	124	685

Table B

Friday, February 8, 2019

Time	Campbell/ Chestnut	Campbell/ Highland	Campbell/ Vail	Sigwalt/ Highland	Total
4:00 PM	355	366	579	395	1695
5:00 PM	419	451	740	465	2075
6:00 PM	394	469	812	376	2051
7:00 PM	316	430	682	257	1685
8:00 PM	179	263	472	199	1113
9:00 PM	163	227	376	166	932

Table C

Saturday, February 9, 2019

Time	Campbell/ Chestnut	Campbell/ Highland	Campbell/ Vail	Sigwalt/ Highland	Total
4:00 PM	277	329	583	258	1447
5:00 PM	382	486	763	305	1936
6:00 PM	337	465	789	316	1907
7:00 PM	316	422	699	293	1730
8:00 PM	154	287	428	156	1025
9:00 PM	163	228	371	139	901

PLAN COMMISSION PROJECT TIMELINE

Project Name: Arlington 425
 PC Number: 19-001
 Location: Campbell/Highland/Chestnut
 Requested Action:

1. Rezoning from R-3, One-Family Dwelling District to B-5, Downtown District for four lots of the subject property.
2. Planned Unit Development approval to allow a 361-unit mixed-use residential development.
3. Preliminary Plat of Subdivision approval to consolidate the 17 existing platted lots on the subject property into one lot.
4. Land Use Variation to allow residential uses as a principal use in the B-5 District for the proposed building along Chestnut Avenue.
5. Multiple Variations

	Date	# of Business Days
Petitioner Provides Plans needed for CPRC	11/28/18	-
Conceptual Plan Review Meeting (CPRC)	12/12/18	10
Awaiting PC Application	01/17/19	23
PC Application Submittal Date	01/17/19	-
1 st Round Department Comments	02/01/19	10
Petitioner's Response – 1 st Round	02/26/19	17
2 nd Round Department Comments	03/08/19	8
Petitioner's Response – 2 nd Round	03/15/19	5
1 st PC Hearing (resulted in continuance)	03/27/19	48 days from application date
2 nd PC Hearing	04/10/19	10
Village Board	05/13/19	23
Anticipated Village Board Ord. Adoption	TBD	

PROTEST AGAINST AMENDMENT-ARLINGTON 425

Protest Petition Against Arlington 425 - Highland/Campbell/Chestnut PC#19-001

The purpose of this petition is to invoke Arlington Heights Municipal Code Chapter 28, Section 15.6, such that the approval of any amendment regarding the above listed development will not be passed except by the favorable vote of two-thirds of all members of the Village Board.

We, the undersigned, are owners of frontage of property immediately adjoining or across an alley from or directly opposite frontage which is proposed to be altered. The attached signatures represent owners of greater than 20% of the frontage of property described above, per Chapter 28, Section 15.6.

VILLAGE CLERK

MAY 09 2019

Village of Arlington Heights

Signature of Property Owner

Property Owner(s): José Schwab

Address: 12 S Chestnut Ave

Signature(s): [Signature]
[Signature]

Notary:

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 28th day of April


Notary Public: Mary K. Carlson

State Of: Illinois

County Of: Cook

My Commission Expires: January 30, 2021

Stamp:



Signature of Property Owner

Property Owner(s): John and Stacey Castanoli

Address: 18 S. Chestnut Ave. Arlington Heights, IL 60005

Signature(s): John Castanoli
Stacey Castanoli

Notary:

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 8th day of May, 2019


Notary Public: Mary K. Carlson

State Of: Illinois

County Of: Cook

My Commission Expires: January 30, 2021

Stamp:



Mary K Carlson

VILLAGE CLERK

MAY 09 2019

Village of Arlington Heights

Signature of Property Owner

Property Owner(s): JAMES CORCORAN

Address: 24 S. CHESTNUT AVE. ARLINGTON HEIGHTS, IL

Signature(s): [Signature]

Notary:

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 8th day of May, 2019


Notary Public: Mary K. Carlson

State Of: Illinois

County Of: Cook

My Commission Expires: January 30, 2021

Stamp:



Mary K. Carlson

VILLAGE CLERK

MAY 09 2019

Village of Arlington Heights

Signature of Property Owner

Property Owner(s): Paul Praxmarer

Address: 26 S. Chestnut Ail Hts

Signature(s): [Signature]

Notary:

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 27th day of April


Notary Public: Mary K Carlson

State Of: Illinois

County Of: Cook

My Commission Expires: January 30, 2021

Stamp:



Signature of Property Owner

Property Owner(s): LOU & DONNA GREIFENSTON

Address: 30 S. CHESTNUT AVE. ARLINGTON HTS 60005

Signature(s): [Signature]
[Signature]

Notary:

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 27th day of April


Notary Public: Mary K. Carlson

State Of: Illinois

County Of: Cook

My Commission Expires: January 30, 2021

Stamp:



Signature of Property Owner

Property Owner(s): Daniel and Kari Dwyer

Address: 30 S. Chestnut Ave

Signature(s): Kari Dwyer

Daniel Dwyer

Notary:

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 27th day of April

Notary Public: Mary K Carlson

State Of: Illinois

County Of: Cook

My Commission Expires: January 30, 2021

Stamp:

